

Statistical anisotropy of the curvature perturbation from vector field perturbations

Konstantinos Dimopoulos,^{1,*} Mindaugas Karčiauskas,^{1,†} David H. Lyth,^{1,‡} and Yeinzon Rodríguez^{2,3,§}

¹*Department of Physics, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YB, UK*

²*Centro de Investigaciones, Universidad Antonio Nariño, Cra 3 Este # 47A-15, Bogotá D.C., Colombia*

³*Escuela de Física, Universidad Industrial de Santander, Ciudad Universitaria, Bucaramanga, Colombia*

The δN formula for the primordial curvature perturbation ζ is extended to include vector as well as scalar fields. Formulas for the tree-level contributions to the spectrum and bispectrum of ζ are given, exhibiting statistical anisotropy. The one-loop contribution to the spectrum of ζ is also worked out. We then consider the generation of vector field perturbations from the vacuum, including the longitudinal component that will be present if there is no gauge invariance. Finally, the δN formula is applied to the vector curvaton and vector inflation models with the tensor perturbation also evaluated in the latter case.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq

I. INTRODUCTION

Starting at an ‘initial’ temperature of a few MeV, the observable Universe is now understood in considerable detail. At the initial epoch the expanding Universe is an almost isotropic and homogeneous gas. The perturbations away from perfect isotropy and homogeneity at the initial epoch are the subject of intense study at present, because they determine the subsequent evolution of all cosmological perturbations [1]. According to observation, the dominant and perhaps the only initial perturbation is the curvature perturbation ζ , so-called because it is related to the perturbation in the intrinsic curvature of space-time slices with uniform energy density.

To understand the nature and origin of ζ , one uses comoving coordinates $\mathbf{x}$, that move with expansion of the unperturbed Universe. Also, one considers the Fourier components with comoving wave-vector $\mathbf{k}$. Physical positions are $a(t)\mathbf{x}$ and physical wave-vectors are $\mathbf{k}/a(t)$, where a is the scale factor of the Universe. The Hubble parameter is $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$, with a dot denoting derivative with respect to the cosmic time t .

It is convenient to smooth all relevant quantities on a comoving scale, somewhat below the shortest scale of cosmological interest. This will not affect the Fourier components on cosmological scales, and will greatly simplify the analysis. Consider a given cosmological scale, characterised by wavenumber k/a . On the assumption that gravity slows down the expansion of the cosmic fluid, $aH/k = \dot{a}/k$ increases as we go back in time. At the present epoch scales of cosmological interest correspond to $10^{-6} \lesssim aH/k \lesssim 1$, but at the ‘initial’ temperature $T \sim \text{MeV}$ they all correspond to $aH/k \gg 1$. Such scales are said to be outside the horizon.

To explain the origin of the perturbations, it is supposed that going further back in time we reach an era of inflation when by definition gravity is repulsive. At the beginning of inflation the smoothing scale is supposed to be inside the horizon. With mild assumptions, it can be shown that inflation drives all perturbations to zero at the classical level. But as each scale k leaves the horizon, the quantum fluctuations of those scalar field perturbations with mass $m \lesssim H$ are converted [2, 3] to classical perturbations.

According to the usual assumption, one or more of these scalar field perturbations is responsible for the curvature perturbation (for a recent account with references see Ref. [4]). In that case, the statistical properties of ζ (specified by its correlators) are homogeneous and isotropic (invariant under displacements and rotations). It has been pointed out recently that vector field perturbations could contribute to ζ [5, 6, 7, 8]^{#1}. Such contributions will typically make ζ statistically anisotropic, but still statistically homogeneous.

It was shown in an earlier paper [10] how, including only scalar fields, one may calculate the correlators of ζ through what is called the δN formalism [11, 12, 13]. The δN formalism has recently been applied to the vector field case in a particular setup [8]. In this paper, we work out a completely general δN formalism including vector fields and then apply it to a different setup used for the vector curvaton [5, 6, 7] and vector inflation [14] scenarios.

*Electronic address: konst.dimopoulos@lancaster.ac.uk

†Electronic address: m.karciauskas@lancaster.ac.uk

‡Electronic address: d.lyth@lancaster.ac.uk

§Electronic address: yeinzon.rodriguez@uan.edu.co

^{#1} Non-standard spinors may be used for the same purpose. See Ref. [9].

The plan of the paper is the following. In Section II we give some useful formulas and survey the observational status regarding statistical anisotropy. Section III is devoted to a brief description of the δN formalism, this time including vector fields. In Section IV we calculate the spectrum of ζ at tree and one-loop level, and the bispectrum of ζ at tree level. In Section V we recall the generation of a scalar field perturbation from the vacuum. In Section VI we see how a gauge field perturbation can be generated. In Section VII we see how a vector field perturbation can be generated, using a modified-gravity action without gauge invariance and including the longitudinal component. In Sections VIII and IX we see how a vector field perturbation can contribute to ζ , through respectively the vector curvaton and vector inflation mechanisms. We conclude in Section X.

II. OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS ON THE CURVATURE PERTURBATION

Direct information on the curvature perturbation comes mostly from measurements of the anisotropy of the CMB and the inhomogeneity of the galaxy distribution. These cover a limited range of scales, corresponding to roughly $\Delta \ln k \sim 10$ where k is the comoving wavenumber. Indirect information is available at much longer and shorter scales. In this section we summarise the information.

A. Formulas

We are interested in the correlators of the curvature perturbation, in particular the two-point correlator. For any cosmological perturbation $\beta(\mathbf{x})$, at some fixed time, we define Fourier components with normalisation

$$\beta(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \int \beta(\mathbf{x}) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} d^3x. \quad (1)$$

Assuming that the two-point correlator $\langle \beta(\mathbf{x})\beta(\mathbf{x}') \rangle$ is invariant under translations (statistically homogeneous), the two-point correlator of the Fourier components takes the form

$$\langle \beta(\mathbf{k})\beta(\mathbf{k}') \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}_\beta(\mathbf{k}), \quad (2)$$

which defines the spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\beta$ ^{#2}. If the two-point correlator is also invariant under rotations (statistical isotropy) the spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\mathbf{k})$ depends only on the magnitude k . In that case we shall sometimes invoke a quantity $P_\beta(k) \equiv (2\pi^2/k^3)\mathcal{P}_\beta(k)$.

By virtue of the reality condition $\beta(-\mathbf{k}) = \beta^*(\mathbf{k})$, an equivalent definition of the spectrum is

$$\langle \beta(\mathbf{k})\beta^*(\mathbf{k}') \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}_\beta(\mathbf{k}). \quad (3)$$

Setting $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}'$ the left hand side is $\langle |\beta(\mathbf{k})|^2 \rangle$. It follows that the spectrum is positive and nonzero.

Even if $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\mathbf{k})$ is anisotropic, the reality condition requires $\mathcal{P}_\beta(\mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{P}_\beta(-\mathbf{k})$. The anisotropy will therefore be of the form [15] (see also Refs. [16, 17])

$$\mathcal{P}_\beta(\mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{P}_\beta^{\text{iso}}(k) \left[1 + g_\beta(\hat{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}})^2 + \dots \right], \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_\beta^{\text{iso}}(k)$ is the average over all directions, $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ is some unit vector and $\hat{\mathbf{k}}$ is a unit vector along $\mathbf{k}$.

If there is no correlation between the Fourier components except for the reality condition, the perturbation is said to be Gaussian. Then the two-point correlator is given by Eq. (2) and the three-point correlator vanishes while the four-point correlator is

$$\langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}_1}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_2}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_3}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_4} \rangle = \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}_1}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_2} \rangle \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}_3}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_4} \rangle + \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}_1}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_3} \rangle \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}_2}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_4} \rangle + \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}_1}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_4} \rangle \langle \beta_{\mathbf{k}_2}\beta_{\mathbf{k}_3} \rangle. \quad (5)$$

The five-point correlator vanishes and the six-point correlator is given by the analogue of Eq. (5), and so on. All correlators are known once the spectrum is specified. We conclude that *a Gaussian perturbation is statistically homogeneous* even though it need not be statistically isotropic.

^{#2} The averages are over some ensemble of universes, of which our observable Universe is supposed to be a typical realization.

Non-gaussianity is signalled by a non-vanishing 3-point correlator, an additional (‘connected’) contribution to the 4-point correlator and so on. Statistical homogeneity requires that each correlator of Fourier components vanishes unless the sum of the wave-vectors vanishes (generalising the delta function of Eq. (2)), and statistical isotropy requires that it is invariant under rotations. In particular, statistical homogeneity requires a 3-point correlator of the form

$$\langle \beta(\mathbf{k})\beta(\mathbf{k}')\beta(\mathbf{k}'') \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{k}'') B(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{k}''), \quad (6)$$

and statistical isotropy requires that B depends only on the magnitudes of the vectors. Assuming statistical isotropy one also defines a reduced bispectrum $\mathcal{B}_\beta$ by

$$B_\beta(k, k', k'') \equiv \mathcal{B}_\beta(k, k', k'') [P_\beta(k)P_\beta(k') + \text{cyclic permutations}]. \quad (7)$$

B. Spectrum and non-gaussianity

Observational results concerning the spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ are generally obtained with the assumption of statistical isotropy, but they would not be greatly affected by the inclusion of anisotropy at the 10% level.

Direct observation, coming from the anisotropy of the CMB and the inhomogeneity of the galaxy distribution, gives information on what are called cosmological scales [18]. These correspond to a range $\Delta \ln k \sim 10$ or so downwards from the scale $k^{-1} \sim H_0^{-1}$ that corresponds to the size of the observable Universe^{#3}. It is found that $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ is almost scale independent with the value $\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2} \simeq 5 \times 10^{-5}$. There is mild scale dependence corresponding to

$$n - 1 \equiv \frac{d \ln \mathcal{P}_\zeta}{d \ln k} = -0.040 \pm 0.014. \quad (8)$$

On much bigger or smaller scales the constraint is far weaker. Assuming a constant n on such scales, they are

$$-5 < n - 1 \lesssim 0.4 \frac{50}{N_{\text{corr}}}, \quad N_{\text{corr}} \equiv \ln(k_{\text{corr}}/k_{\text{max}}). \quad (9)$$

The lower bound, referring to very large scales $k \ll H_0$, comes [1] from the absence of an enhancement of the CMB quadrupole (Grishchuk-Zeldovich effect).

The upper bound is more interesting. In this expression, N_{corr} is the number of e -folds of inflation, between horizon exit for the smallest cosmological scale k_{max}^{-1} and horizon exit for the smallest scale k_{corr}^{-1} on which the curvature perturbation exists (correlation length). It corresponds [19] to the following values for the spectrum at those scales:

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k_{\text{max}}) \lesssim 5 \times 10^{-5}, \quad \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}(k_{\text{corr}}) < 10^{-1}. \quad (10)$$

The first number is the observed value on cosmological scales. The second number corresponds to an order of magnitude upper bound on the spectrum that under certain assumptions is required to avoid an overabundance of primordial black holes [20]. Further discussion about the upper bound on $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ is given in Ref. [19].

If ζ is generated during inflation, or soon afterwards, k_{corr} will be the scale leaving the horizon at the end of inflation. Then $N_{\text{corr}} \simeq N - 10$, where N is the number of e -folds of inflation after the largest cosmological scale H_0^{-1} leaves the horizon. For a high inflation scale and a fairly standard cosmology afterwards, $N \simeq 60$ making $N_{\text{corr}} \simeq 50$. If instead ζ is formed long after inflation, through say the curvaton model, N_{corr} can be much lower for the same N , and N itself will be reduced if the inflation scale is low.

If the spectral tilt varies, the upper bound refers to average of the tilt with respect to $\ln k$, in the interval $k_{\text{max}} < k_{\text{corr}}$. The possibility of large tilt on small scales has been investigated in Ref. [19]. A strongly increasing tilt on small scales could come from a single mechanism for generating n , such as the running mass inflation model. Alternatively, a large and practically constant n on small scales could be generated if the curvature perturbation has two components:

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) = \mathcal{P}_{\text{flat}}(k) + \mathcal{P}_{\text{steep}}(k). \quad (11)$$

The first component might be nearly flat and dominate on cosmological scales, while the second might have large tilt and dominate in the interval $k_{\text{max}} < k < k_{\text{corr}}$. In that case, the upper bound in Eq. (9) applies to the spectral tilt of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{steep}}$.

^{#3} As usual a subscript 0 indicates the present epoch, and we set $a_0 = 1$.

Coming to non-gaussianity, one generally focusses on the bispectrum, working with the quantity $f_{\text{NL}} \equiv (5/6)\mathcal{B}_\zeta$. If f_{NL} is generated from one or more gaussian field perturbations with scale-independent spectra it is practically scale independent. With that assumption, the most recent analysis [21] finds $f_{\text{NL}} = 38 \pm 21$ at 1σ but $-4 < f_{\text{NL}} < 80$ is allowed at 95% confidence level. For fully correlated non-gaussianity, $f_{\text{NL}}\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{-1/2}$ is of order the fractional non-gaussianity of ζ which means that the non-gaussian fraction is less than 10^{-3} or so, and in any case the observational bound on f_{NL} corresponds to a small non-gaussian fraction [22].

Allowing scale dependence of the bispectrum, the observational bounds are very weak on scales outside the cosmological range, so that for example ζ could be the square of a gaussian quantity.

C. Statistical anisotropy and statistical inhomogeneity

Taking all the uncertainties into account, observation is consistent with statistical anisotropy and statistical inhomogeneity but allows either of these things at around the 10% level. In this section we briefly review what is known.

Assuming statistical homogeneity of the curvature perturbation, a recent study [23] (see also Refs. [24, 25]) of the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMB) temperature perturbation finds weak evidence for statistical anisotropy. They keep only the leading term of Eq. (4):

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(\mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{\text{iso}}(k) \left(1 + g(\hat{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}})^2\right), \quad (12)$$

and find $g \simeq 0.15 \pm 0.04$ with $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ in a specified direction. The authors point out though that systematic uncertainties could make g compatible with zero. We will therefore just assume $|g| \lesssim 0.3$ ^{#4}. In other words, we assume that the spectrum of the curvature perturbation is isotropic to within thirty percent or so. There is at present no bound on statistical anisotropy of the 3-point or higher correlators.

In some different studies, the mean-square CMB perturbation in opposite hemispheres has been measured, to see if there is any difference between hemispheres. A recent work [27, 28, 29] finds a difference of order ten percent, for a certain choice of the hemispheres, with statistical significance at the 99% level. Given the difficulty of handling systematic uncertainties it would be premature to regard the evidence for this hemispherical anisotropy as completely overwhelming.

Let us see what hemispherical anisotropy would imply for the curvature perturbation. Focussing on a small patch of sky, the statistical anisotropy of the curvature perturbation implies that the mean-square temperature perturbation within a given small patch will *in general* depend on the direction of that patch. This is because the mean square within such a patch depends (in the sudden decoupling approximation) upon the mean square of the curvature perturbation in a small planar region of space perpendicular to the line of sight located at last scattering^{#5}. But the mean-square temperature will be *the same* in patches at opposite directions in the sky, because they explore the curvature perturbation $\zeta(\mathbf{k})$ in the same $\mathbf{k}$ -plane and the spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\zeta(\mathbf{k})$ is invariant under the change $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow -\mathbf{k}$. It follows that statistical anisotropy of the curvature perturbation cannot by itself generate a hemispherical anisotropy.

In the above discussion of the CMB temperature perturbation, we ignored cosmic variance, by identifying the measured mean-square temperature perturbation within a given patch with the ensemble average of that quantity. That will certainly be permissible if the multipoles of the CMB, *including the lowest ones*, are almost uncorrelated corresponding to an almost gaussian curvature perturbation.

With the caveat concerning cosmic variance, we conclude that hemispherical anisotropy of the CMB temperature requires statistical *inhomogeneity* of the curvature perturbation. Then $\langle \zeta(\mathbf{k})\zeta(\mathbf{k}') \rangle$ is not proportional to $\delta(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{k}')$. But in a small region of the observable Universe it might still be reasonable to invoke approximate statistical homogeneity, by defining a position-dependent spectrum $\mathcal{P}(k, \mathbf{x})$ (taken for simplicity to be rotationally invariant). This way of generating the hemispherical anisotropy has been considered in Refs. [30, 31], but is outside the framework of the present paper.

Before ending this section we note that, in addition to the primordial curvature perturbation, there might be a primordial tensor perturbation with spectrum $\mathcal{P}_h$ [1]. The fraction $r \equiv \mathcal{P}_h/\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ is constrained by observation to be $\lesssim 0.1$ [18].

^{#4} A related work [26] shows that the lowest detectable value for $|g|$ from the expected performance of WMAP is $|g| \simeq 0.1$. The same analysis gives the lowest detectable value from the expected performance of PLANCK: $|g| \simeq 0.02$.

^{#5} The sudden decoupling is not essential here. It can be replaced by the exact line of sight formalism, leading to the same conclusion.

III. THE δN FORMALISM

The δN formalism for scalar field perturbations was given at the linear level in Refs. [11, 12]. At the non-linear level which generates non-gaussianity it was described in Refs. [10, 13]. Here we extend the formalism to include vector fields.

With generic coordinates the line element of the perturbed universe is

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu dx^\nu. \quad (13)$$

The coordinate system of the perturbed universe defines a slicing (constant time coordinates) and a threading (constant space coordinates) of spacetime.

To define the cosmological perturbations, one chooses a coordinate system in the perturbed universe, and then compares that universe with an unperturbed one. The unperturbed universe is taken to be homogeneous, and is usually taken to be isotropic as well. In this Section though, we develop the δN formalism without assuming isotropy.

The δN formalism does not invoke a theory of gravity, but it does invoke an energy-momentum tensor $T_{\mu\nu}$. From a mathematical viewpoint, any definition will do provided that it satisfies the continuity equation $\nabla_\mu T^\mu_\nu = 0$ with ∇_μ the covariant derivative. Following for instance Refs. [14, 32], we define $T_{\mu\nu}$ in terms of the spacetime curvature:

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R = -8\pi GT_{\mu\nu}. \quad (14)$$

This is the Einstein field equation if, in a locally inertial frame, $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the energy-momentum tensor of Special Relativity. In the context of field theory, this means that the action should be of the form

$$S = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} m_P^2 R + \mathcal{L} \right], \quad (15)$$

where $m_P \equiv (8\pi G)^{-1/2}$ is the reduced Planck mass, and $\mathcal{L}$, evaluated in a locally inertial frame, is the lagrangian density of flat spacetime field theory. Then $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the ‘improved energy-momentum tensor’ which is given in terms of the fields by a standard expression. The bosonic part $\mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}}$ of $\mathcal{L}$ gives a contribution

$$T_{\mu\nu}^{\text{bos}} = 2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}}}{\partial g^{\mu\nu}} - g_{\mu\nu} \mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}}. \quad (16)$$

Of course, we can always write the action in the form given by Eq. (15) with some $\mathcal{L}$. When that is done, the contribution of the bosonic part $\mathcal{L}_{\text{bos}}$ will still be given by Eq. (16). We shall invoke this expression in several cases where Einstein gravity holds, and will invoke it in Section IX for a case where Einstein gravity does not hold, dropping the label ‘bos’.

A. The curvature perturbation and the tensor perturbation

To define the curvature perturbation, we smooth the metric tensor and the energy-momentum tensor on a comoving scale k^{-1} significantly shorter than the scales of interest, and we consider the super-horizon regime $aH \gg k$. On the reasonable assumption that the smoothing scale is the biggest relevant scale, spatial gradients of the smoothed metric and energy-momentum tensors will be negligible. As a result, the evolution of these quantities at each comoving location will be that of some homogeneous ‘separate universe’. In contrast with earlier works on the separation universe assumption, we will in this section allow the possibility that the separate universes are anisotropic even though homogeneous.

We consider the slicing of spacetime with uniform energy density, and the threading which moves with the expansion (comoving threading). By virtue of the separate universe assumption, the threading will be orthogonal to the slicing. The spatial metric can then be written as

$$g_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \equiv a^2(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \left(I e^{2h(\mathbf{x}, \tau)} \right)_{ij}, \quad (17)$$

where I is the unit matrix, and the matrix h is traceless, which means that $I e^{2h}$ has unit determinant. The time dependence of the locally defined scale factor $a(\mathbf{x}, t)$ defines the rate at which an infinitesimal comoving volume $\mathcal{V}$ expands: $\dot{\mathcal{V}}/\mathcal{V} = 3\dot{a}/a$.

We split $\ln a$ and h_{ij} into an unperturbed part plus a perturbation:

$$\ln a(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \equiv \ln a(\tau) + \zeta(\mathbf{x}, \tau), \quad (18)$$

$$h_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \equiv h_{ij}(\tau) + \delta h_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \tau). \quad (19)$$

The unperturbed parts can be defined as spatial averages within the observable Universe, but any definition will do as long as it makes the perturbations small within the observable Universe. If they are small enough, ζ and δh_{ij} can be treated as first-order perturbations. That is expected to be the case, with the proviso that a second-order treatment of ζ will be necessary to handle its non-gaussianity if that is present at a level corresponding to $f_{\text{NL}} \lesssim 1$ (with the gaussian and non-gaussian components correlated) [33].

1. The curvature perturbation

In this paper we are mainly concerned with the curvature perturbation ζ ^{#6}. Because Ie^h has unit determinant, the energy continuity equation $d(\mathcal{V}\rho) = -Pd\mathcal{V}$ implies that ζ is independent of position, during any era when the pressure P is a unique function of the energy density ρ [13] (hence uniform on slices of uniform ρ). Absorbing ζ into the unperturbed scale factor, $\zeta(\mathbf{x})$ is then time independent.

From the success of Big Bang Nucleosynthesis, we know that Einstein gravity is a good approximation when the shortest cosmological scale approaches horizon entry at $T \sim 1$ MeV. Also, the cosmic fluid is then radiation dominated to high accuracy implying $P = \rho/3$ and a constant value of ζ . We denote this value simply by $\zeta(\mathbf{x})$, and it is the one constrained by observation as described in Section II.

2. The tensor perturbation

The perturbation δh_{ij} may also be of interest. We discuss it at this point in general terms, and in Section IX we provide an explicit calculation within the vector inflation model.

Consider first the unperturbed quantity $h_{ij}(\tau)$. In this paper we are taking the unperturbed expansion to be practically isotropic expansion with Cartesian coordinates. As a result, we can take the unperturbed quantity to vanish so that $a(\tau)$ is the unperturbed scale factor. More generally, if the unperturbed quantity is any time-independent matrix, we can make a linear coordinate transformation which diagonalises Ie^h and can then choose the normalization of the scale factor so that h_{ij} again vanishes. A time-dependent unperturbed quantity $h_{ij}(\tau)$ would correspond to an unperturbed Universe with anisotropic expansion.

If one or more vector fields exist during inflation, one might think that the unperturbed expansion may easily be anisotropic. Assuming Einstein gravity though, that is not the case because according to a theorem of Wald [34, 35] enough inflation driven by a constant scalar field potential will isotropise the expansion^{#7}. This statement becomes only an approximation for realistic slow roll inflation where the potential is varying, and it doesn't apply to 'vector inflation' models where inflation is driven by a constant vector field potential [14, 36, 37, 38]. For vector inflation though, one can ensure approximate isotropy of the expansion by invoking a large number of independent fields [14], as we shall discuss in Section IX.

After inflation, an era of anisotropic stress (from vector fields or any other source) might cause significant anisotropy of the expansion, but that does not happen in the usual scenarios of the early Universe. Assuming Einstein gravity, the anisotropy will anyway decay when the anisotropic stress switches off.

As we are dealing with a smoothed metric well after horizon exit, the status of the perturbed quantity $h_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \tau)$ at a given location is the same as that of the unperturbed quantity. The anisotropy of the local expansion will be negligible if Wald's theorem holds or if there is vector inflation with a sufficiently large number of independent vector fields. Then the perturbation $\delta h_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \tau)$ is almost time independent. Also, we expect δh_{ij} to remain time-independent after inflation until the approach of horizon entry, since the local anisotropic stress is expected to remain negligible.

Now we consider first order cosmological perturbation theory, taking the unperturbed h_{ij} to vanish. At first order, the equations satisfied by the cosmological perturbations comprise three uncoupled modes, termed scalar, vector and tensor. The first order perturbation δg_{ij} is equal to $\delta_{ij}\zeta + \delta h_{ij}$ with ζ belonging to the scalar mode. Setting spatial

^{#6} It is so-called because one usually has in mind the case that δh_{ij} is negligible; of course it too corresponds to a perturbation in the spatial curvature.

^{#7} He calls this constant potential a cosmological constant.

gradients equal to zero in accordance with the separate universe assumption, δh_{ij} satisfies the transversality condition $\partial_i \delta h_{ij} = 0$, which means that it belongs to the tensor mode. It can be written in terms of polarization tensors as $e_{ij}^+ h_+ + e_{ij}^- h_-$, and assuming statistical parity invariance each of the amplitudes has the same spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{\text{ten}}/4$. The fraction $r \equiv \mathcal{P}_{\text{ten}}/\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ is $\lesssim 10^{-1}$ [18] and future measurements will reduce this bound by a factor of 10 to 100, or detect r [39].

Let us discuss the origin of the tensor perturbation δh_{ij} , within first order cosmological perturbation theory assuming Einstein gravity. The standard calculation assumes negligible anisotropy in the inflationary expansion and negligible anisotropic stress (which will certainly be the case if scalar fields dominate). Under these assumptions, each of $h_{+,\times}/\sqrt{2}m_P$ has the action of a free scalar field. The classical equation of motion is

$$\ddot{\delta h}_{ij} + 3H\dot{\delta h}_{ij} + (k^2/a^2)\delta h_{ij} = 0, \quad (20)$$

which makes δh_{ij} constant after horizon exit. The spectrum of the perturbation generated from the vacuum fluctuation is

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{ten}} = \frac{8}{M_{\text{Pl}}^2} \left(\frac{H_*}{2\pi} \right)^2, \quad (21)$$

which is too small to observe in small-field inflation models.

If one or more vector fields is relevant during inflation, the unperturbed expansion will be anisotropic at some level. Then, even if the vector field is unperturbed, δh_{ij} will time dependent during inflation, and can be generated even if the vacuum fluctuation is negligible; such a contribution would be correlated with the curvature perturbation [40, 41], in contrast with the one generated from the vacuum fluctuation. A perturbation of the vector field will give an additional effect. As we argued earlier these effects are expected to be negligible if Einstein gravity holds, assuming that either Wald's theorem applies or there is vector inflation with sufficiently many independent fields.

Within this first order treatment, the tensor perturbation is gaussian. Since the tensor perturbation has yet to be detected there is little motivation to consider its non-gaussianity. At the time of writing, the only calculation of non-gaussianity has been done by Maldacena [42] assuming single field slow roll inflation with Einstein gravity. Using second order perturbation theory he chooses a gauge where δh_{ij} is transverse as well as traceless. He calculates the three-point correlators involving Fourier components of ζ and/or δh_{ij} , at the epoch soon after horizon exit, and finds them to be suppressed by slow roll factors. If ζ receives contributions only from the inflaton perturbation, it is constant after horizon exit and then the three point correlator of ζ corresponds to $f_{\text{NL}} \sim 10^{-2}$ which is almost certainly too small ever to detect. There is no reason to think that the correlators involving δh_{ij} will be detectable either. Judging by this example, there is no need for the discussion of δh_{ij} to go beyond first order cosmological perturbation theory.

B. The δN formula

Keeping the comoving threading, we can write the analogue of Eq. (17) for a generic slicing:

$$\tilde{g}_{ij}(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \equiv \tilde{a}^2(\mathbf{x}, \tau) \left(I e^{2\tilde{h}(\mathbf{x}, \tau)} \right)_{ij}, \quad (22)$$

with again $I e^{2\tilde{h}}$ having unit determinant so that the rate of volume expansion is $\dot{\mathcal{V}}/\mathcal{V} = 3\dot{\tilde{a}}(\mathbf{x}, t)$. Starting with an initial 'flat' slicing such that the locally-defined scale factor is homogeneous, and ending with a slicing of uniform density, we then have

$$\zeta(\mathbf{x}, t) = \delta N(\mathbf{x}, t), \quad (23)$$

where the number of e -folds of expansion is defined in terms of the volume expansion by the usual expression $\dot{N} = \dot{\mathcal{V}}/3\mathcal{V}$. The choice of the initial epoch has no effect on δN , because the expansion going from one flat slice to another is uniform. We will choose the initial epoch to be a few Hubble times after the smoothing scale leaves the horizon during inflation. According to the usual assumption, the evolution of the local expansion rate is determined by the initial values of one or more of the perturbed scalar fields ϕ_I . Then we can write

$$\phi_I(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_I + \delta\phi_I(\mathbf{x}), \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\mathbf{x}, t) &= \delta N(\phi_1(\mathbf{x}), \phi_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, t) \\ &= N_I(t)\delta\phi_I(\mathbf{x}) + \frac{1}{2}N_{IJ}(t)\delta\phi_I(\mathbf{x})\delta\phi_J(\mathbf{x}) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $N_I \equiv \partial N / \partial \phi_I$, etc., and the partial derivatives are evaluated with the fields at their unperturbed values denoted simply by ϕ_I . The field perturbations $\delta\phi_I$ in Eq. (25) are defined on the ‘flat’ slicing such that $a(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is uniform.

The unperturbed field values are defined as the spatial averages, over a comoving box within which the perturbations are defined. The box size aL should satisfy $LH_0 \gg 1$ so that the observable Universe should fit comfortably inside it [43]. If there have been exponentially many e -folds of inflation before the observable Universe leaves the horizon, one could choose $\ln(LH_0)$ to be exponentially large, but that would not be a good idea because it introduces unknowable new physics and places the calculation out of control [43]. One therefore chooses a ‘minimal box’, such that $\ln(LH_0)$ is significantly bigger than 1 without being exponentially large.

The spatial averages of the scalar fields, that determine N_I , etc., and hence ζ cannot in general be calculated. Instead they are parameters, that have to be specified along with the relevant parameters of the action before the correlators of ζ can be calculated. The only exception is when ζ is determined by the perturbation of the inflaton in single-field inflation. Then, the unperturbed field value when cosmological scales leave the horizon can be calculated, knowing the number of e -folds to the end of inflation which is determined by the evolution of the scale factor after inflation. Although the unperturbed field values cannot be calculated, their mean square for a random location of the minimal box (ie. of the observable Universe) can sometimes be calculated using the stochastic formalism [44].

In this paper we suppose that one or more perturbed vector fields also affect the evolution of the local expansion rate. Keeping for simplicity one scalar field and one vector field we have

$$\zeta(\mathbf{x}, t) = \delta N(\phi(\mathbf{x}), A_i(\mathbf{x}), t) = N_\phi \delta\phi + N_A^i \delta A_i + \frac{1}{2} N_{\phi\phi} (\delta\phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} N_{\phi A}^i \delta\phi \delta A_i + \frac{1}{2} N_{AA}^{ij} \delta A_i \delta A_j + \dots, \quad (26)$$

where

$$N_\phi \equiv \frac{\partial N}{\partial \phi}, \quad N_A^i \equiv \frac{\partial N}{\partial A_i}, \quad N_{\phi\phi} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial \phi^2}, \quad N_{AA}^{ij} \equiv \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial A_i \partial A_j}, \quad N_{\phi A}^i \equiv \frac{\partial^2 N}{\partial A_i \partial \phi}, \quad (27)$$

with i denoting the spatial indices running from 1 to 3. As with the scalar fields, the unperturbed vector field values are defined as averages within the chosen box.

In these formulas there is no need to define the basis (triad) for the components A_i . Also, we need not assume that A_i comes from a 4-vector field, still less from a gauge field.

The discussion so far allows the unperturbed expansion to be anisotropic. In the following sections though, we will take it to be isotropic. Also, we take the unperturbed spatial geometry to be flat. Then the unperturbed line element is

$$ds^2 = a^2(\tau) (-d\tau^2 + \delta_{ij} dx^i dx^j), \quad (28)$$

where τ is conformal time and a is the scale factor. Depending on the context, we may instead use cosmic time t corresponding to $dt = a d\tau$. We shall take A_i to be the physical field, defined with respect to the orthonormal basis induced by the Cartesian space coordinates $r^i = a(t)x^i$. We shall also have occasion to consider the field $B_i = aA_i$ that is defined with respect to the orthogonal (but not orthonormal) basis induced by the comoving coordinates x^i . The corresponding upper-index quantities are $A^i = A_i$ and $B^i = a^{-2}B_i$.

C. The growth of ζ

As noted earlier, ζ is constant during any era when pressure P is a unique function of energy density ρ . In the simplest scenario, the field whose perturbation generates ζ is the inflaton field ϕ in a single-field model. Then the local value of ϕ is supposed to determine the subsequent evolution of both pressure and energy density, making ζ constant from the beginning.

Alternatives to the simplest scenario generate all or part of ζ at successively later eras. Such generation is possible during any era, unless there is sufficiently complete matter domination ($P = 0$) or radiation domination ($\rho = P/3$). Possibilities in chronological order include generation during (i) multi-field inflation [11], (ii) at the end of inflation [45], (iii) during preheating, (iv) at reheating, and (v) at a second reheating through the curvaton mechanism [46, 47, 48, 49].

A vector field cannot replace the scalar field in the simplest scenario, because unperturbed inflation with a single unperturbed vector field will be very anisotropic and so will be the resulting curvature perturbation. Even with isotropic inflation, we are about to see that a single vector field perturbation cannot be responsible for the entire curvature perturbation (at least in the scenarios that we discuss) because its contribution is highly anisotropic. It could instead be responsible for part of the curvature perturbation, through any of the mechanisms listed above. Of these, the end of inflation mechanism has already been explored [8]. In this paper we explore another one, namely the vector curvaton mechanism [5]. We will also explore the vector inflation scenario [14], according to which inflation is driven by a large number of randomly oriented vector fields which can give sufficiently isotropic inflation and (as we shall see) an extremely isotropic ζ .

IV. FORMULAS FOR THE SPECTRUM AND BISPECTRUM OF THE CURVATURE PERTURBATION

A. Spectrum of the vector field perturbation

In Section V we describe the standard scenario for generating the scalar field perturbations from the vacuum. Within this scenario, these perturbations are Gaussian with no correlation between different perturbations. Their stochastic properties are defined by the spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}$ of each field. Either of the equivalent definitions (2) and (3) can be used to define the spectrum, with $\beta = \delta\phi$.

To deal with a vector field perturbation δA_i we write

$$\delta A_i(\mathbf{k}, \tau) \equiv \sum_{\lambda} e_i^{\lambda}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) \delta A_{\lambda}(\mathbf{k}, \tau), \quad (29)$$

where with the z axis along $\mathbf{k}$ the polarization vectors are defined by

$$e^L \equiv (1, i, 0)/\sqrt{2}, \quad e^R \equiv (1, -i, 0)/\sqrt{2}, \quad e^{\text{long}} \equiv (0, 0, 1). \quad (30)$$

These expressions define the polarization vectors only up to a rotation about the $\mathbf{k}$ direction but that is enough for the present purpose. We will let the change $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow -\mathbf{k}$ reverse z and x but not y . Then $e_{\lambda}(-\hat{\mathbf{k}}) = -e_{\lambda}^*(\hat{\mathbf{k}})$ and there is a reality condition $A_{\lambda}^*(\mathbf{k}, \tau) = -A_{\lambda}(-\mathbf{k}, \tau)$.

If the vector field corresponds to a gauge field, we choose the gauge so that $A_{\text{long}} = 0$ leaving only A_L and A_R . Otherwise we have to keep all three A_{λ} .

In Sections VI and VII we describe two scenarios for generating the vector field perturbations δA_{λ} . Within both of them, these perturbations are statistically isotropic and Gaussian, with no correlation between different λ or between the perturbations of different fields (scalar or vector). As a result we need only to consider the spectra $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda} \equiv \mathcal{P}_{\delta A_{\lambda}}$. They can be defined by the analogue of either Eq. (2) or Eq. (3):

$$\langle \delta A_{\lambda}(\mathbf{k}) \delta A_{\lambda}^*(\mathbf{k}') \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}(k), \quad (31)$$

$$\langle \delta A_{\lambda}(\mathbf{k}) \delta A_{\lambda}(\mathbf{k}') \rangle = -(2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}(k). \quad (32)$$

The spectra are nonzero and positive, with the minus sign in the second expression coming from $e_{\lambda}(-\hat{\mathbf{k}}) = -e_{\lambda}^*(\hat{\mathbf{k}})$.

We will normally have $\mathcal{P}_L = \mathcal{P}_R$, since a difference between these quantities would indicate parity violation of the evolution of A_i . It is therefore useful to define

$$\mathcal{P}_{\pm} \equiv \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{P}_R \pm \mathcal{P}_L), \quad (33)$$

so that only $\mathcal{P}_+$ will normally be present^{#8}.

In the models that we discuss, the scale dependence of the spectra $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda}(k)$ comes from the evolution of the perturbation δA_{λ} after horizon exit during inflation. In this regime, the spatial gradient k/a is negligible compared with the Hubble parameter, and we expect that it will be negligible compared with any other relevant parameter^{#9}. In that case, the evolution of $\delta A_{\lambda}(\mathbf{x}, \tau)$ at each position will be the same as for the unperturbed field $A_i(\tau)$. By rotational invariance the evolution of the latter is independent of i . Therefore, we expect that the evolution of the three perturbations δA_{λ} will become the same after horizon exit, giving them the same spectral index. In that case $r_{\text{long}} \equiv \mathcal{P}_{\text{long}}/\mathcal{P}_+$, will be just a number, independent of k .

The correlators of the $\delta A_i(\mathbf{k})$ are

$$\langle \delta A_i(\mathbf{k}) \delta A_j(\mathbf{k}') \rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \left[T_{ij}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{k}) \mathcal{P}_+(k) + i T_{ij}^{\text{odd}}(\mathbf{k}) \mathcal{P}_-(k) + T_{ij}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k}) \mathcal{P}_{\text{long}}(k) \right], \quad (34)$$

where

$$T_{ij}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \delta_{ij} - \hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j, \quad T_{ij}^{\text{odd}}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \epsilon_{ijk} \hat{k}_k, \quad T_{ij}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \hat{k}_i \hat{k}_j. \quad (35)$$

^{#8} Calculations that generate $\mathcal{P}_-$ as well are described in Refs. [50, 51].

^{#9} This is verified for the specific scenarios that we consider.

B. Spectrum of ζ

1. Tree-level spectrum

Since ζ is gaussian to high accuracy, it seems reasonable to expect that ζ will be dominated by one or more of the linear terms in Eq. (26). Keeping only them (corresponding to what is called the tree-level contribution) we find^{#10}

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{\text{tree}}(\mathbf{k}) = N_\phi^2 \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k) + N_A^i N_A^j \left[T_{ij}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{k}) \mathcal{P}_+(k) + T_{ij}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k}) \mathcal{P}_{\text{long}}(k) \right] \quad (36)$$

$$= N_\phi^2 \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k) + N_A^2 \mathcal{P}_+(k) + (\mathbf{N}_A \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}})^2 \mathcal{P}_+(k) (r_{\text{long}} - 1). \quad (37)$$

The above corresponds to Eq. (12) with $\hat{\mathbf{d}} = \hat{\mathbf{N}}_A$, $\mathbf{N}_A$ being the Cartesian vector with components N_A^i , and

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{\text{iso}}(k) = N_\phi^2 \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k) + N_A^2 \mathcal{P}_+(k), \quad (38)$$

$$g = (r_{\text{long}} - 1) \frac{N_A^2 \mathcal{P}_+(k)}{N_\phi^2 \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k) + N_A^2 \mathcal{P}_+(k)}, \quad (39)$$

where $N_A \equiv \sqrt{N_A^i N_A^i}$ is the magnitude of $\mathbf{N}_A$. The spectrum is scale-invariant if the spectra of the field perturbations are scale invariant.

If the vector field perturbation dominates ζ we have simply $g = r_{\text{long}} - 1$. If the vector field is a gauge field $r_{\text{long}} = 0$, and if its action is Eq. (78) below $r_{\text{long}} = 2$. In both cases, the the observational bound $|g| \lesssim 0.3$ is violated which means that the vector field contribution cannot dominate. If there is no other vector field contribution, the dominant contribution to ζ must then come from one or more scalar field perturbations.

To avoid the need for scalar perturbations, one can suppose that a large number $\mathcal{N}$ of vector fields perturbations contribute to ζ , with random orientation of the unperturbed fields. With a sufficient number of fields, there is then no preferred direction and the curvature perturbation is isotropic.

2. One-loop contribution

Using Eq. (5), the contribution from the quadratic terms (one-loop contribution) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1\text{-loop}}(\mathbf{k}) = & \int \frac{dp}{|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}|^3} \frac{p^2 k^3}{p^3} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} N_\phi^2 \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}|) \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(p) + \right. \\ & + \frac{1}{4} N_{\phi A}^i N_{\phi A}^j \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}|) \left[T_{ij}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{p}) \mathcal{P}_+(p) + T_{ij}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{p}) \mathcal{P}_{\text{long}}(p) \right] + \\ & + \frac{1}{2} N_{AA}^{ij} N_{AA}^{kl} \left\{ T_{ik}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) T_{jl}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{p}) \mathcal{P}_+(|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}|) \mathcal{P}_+(p) + \right. \\ & + T_{ik}^{\text{odd}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) T_{jl}^{\text{odd}}(\mathbf{p}) \mathcal{P}_-(|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}|) \mathcal{P}_-(p) + \\ & + T_{ik}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) T_{jl}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{p}) \mathcal{P}_{\text{long}}(|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}|) \mathcal{P}_{\text{long}}(p) + \\ & \left. \left. + 2 T_{ik}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}) T_{jl}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{p}) \mathcal{P}_+(|\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{p}|) \mathcal{P}_{\text{long}}(p) \right\} \right\}. \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

If the spectra are scale-independent, the integral is proportional to $\ln(kL)$ [53] where L is the box size. If we allow $\ln(kL)$ to be exponentially large the one-loop contribution can dominate the tree-level contribution even with ζ almost gaussian, but the whole calculation is then out of control [43]. With a ‘minimal’ box size such that $\ln(kL)$ is not exponentially large, and keeping only a single scalar field contribution, it has been shown [43] that the ratio $(\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1\text{-loop}}/\mathcal{P}_\zeta^{\text{tree}})^{1/2}$ is of order the fractional non-gaussianity $f_{\text{NL}} \mathcal{P}_\zeta^{1/2}$ of the curvature perturbation which from observation is $\lesssim 10^{-3}$. However, the loop contribution to ζ from a *given* field could dominate the tree level from that field, if both contributions are small compared with the total. This could in particular be the case for the vector field contribution.

^{#10} The terminology tree-level and one-loop corresponds to a Feynman graph formalism [52] that could easily be extended to include vector fields.

C. Bispectrum of ζ

Working to leading order in the quadratic terms of the δN formula, we arrive at the tree-level contribution to the bispectrum. Evaluating it using Eq. (5) we find

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{\zeta}^{\text{tree}}(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{k}'') &= N_{\phi}^2 N_{\phi\phi} [P_{\delta\phi}(k) P_{\delta\phi}(k') + \text{cyc. perm.}] + \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} N_{\phi} N_A^i N_{\phi A}^j \left\{ P_{\delta\phi}(k) \left[T_{ij}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{k}') P_+(k') + i T_{ij}^{\text{odd}}(\mathbf{k}') P_-(k') + T_{ij}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k}') P_{\text{long}}(k') \right] + 5 \text{ perm.} \right\} + \\
&+ N_A^i N_A^j N_{AA}^{kl} \left\{ \left[T_{ik}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{k}) P_+(k) + i T_{ik}^{\text{odd}}(\mathbf{k}) P_-(k) + T_{ik}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k}) P_{\text{long}}(k) \right] \times \right. \\
&\times \left. \left[T_{jl}^{\text{even}}(\mathbf{k}') P_+(k') + i T_{jl}^{\text{odd}}(\mathbf{k}') P_-(k') + T_{jl}^{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k}') P_{\text{long}}(k') \right] + \text{cyc. perm.} \right\}, \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{\delta\phi}(k)$ and $P_{\lambda}(k)$ are defined as

$$P_{\delta\phi}(k) = \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi}(k), \quad P_{\lambda}(k) = \frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}_{\lambda}(k). \tag{42}$$

Reversal of the three wave-vectors corresponds to the parity transformation, and from the reality condition $\zeta(-\mathbf{k}) = \zeta^*(\mathbf{k})$ it changes each correlator into its complex conjugate. For the spectrum this is not of interest because the reality condition also makes the spectrum real. For the bispectrum *with statistical isotropy* it is also not of interest, because the reality condition plus statistical isotropy make the bispectrum real^{#11}. In our case, the bispectrum is statistically anisotropic, and is guaranteed to be real only if the parity-violating spectrum $\mathcal{P}_-$ vanishes.

Existing analysis of the bispectrum assumes statistical isotropy^{#12}, and it seems important that the analysis should be extended to allow for anisotropy and possible parity violation. The relation between non-gaussianity and the anisotropy of the spectrum is explored in Ref. [55].

The second order contribution of the quadratic terms in the δN formula gives the one-loop contribution to the bispectrum. It could be significant or even dominant. It has been calculated for the scalar case in Ref. [22], and has been investigated for the case of multifield inflation in for instance Refs. [56, 57]. The one-loop contribution from a vector perturbation will be given in a separate publication [58].

V. SCALAR FIELD PERTURBATION FROM THE VACUUM FLUCTUATION

During inflation, both scalar and vector field perturbations can be generated from the vacuum fluctuation. We begin by describing carefully the scalar field calculation, emphasising some points that will be important when we come to the vector field.

A. General considerations

We shall focus on the simplest setup. Only the few e -folds either side of horizon exit are considered. Unperturbed inflation is supposed to be isotropic, and almost exponential so that the Hubble parameter can be taken to be constant. It is assumed that the field perturbations can be treated as free fields, so that they satisfy uncoupled linear field equations. Also, the scalar fields are taken to live in unperturbed spacetime, which means that the back-reaction of the fields on the metric is ignored. By virtue of these features, the scalar field perturbations are gaussian and statistically independent, and the object of the calculation is to calculate their spectra.

For the calculation itself we do not need to invoke a theory of gravity or a model of inflation. But these things are needed if one wishes to check that the back-reaction is negligible and the field is practically free. Assuming Einstein gravity and slow-roll inflation, the check has been done as follows. First, the modification of the linear evolution equation to include back-reaction has been calculated, both for single-field [59] and multi-field [60] inflation. It is found to be small, provided that the relevant fields are slowly varying on the Hubble timescale, as will be the case if their potential is flat enough for the slow-roll approximation to apply^{#13}. Second, the treatment of the perturbation

^{#11} The triangle of vectors obtained by reversing the vectors can be brought into coincidence with the original triangle by a rotation.

^{#12} See for instance Ref. [54].

^{#13} From the form of the back-reaction, one expects this to be the case even for non-Einstein gravity [1].

has been carried out to second order [42, 61, 62] and third order [63, 64] (including the back-reaction). From this the 3-point and connected 4-point correlators of ζ were calculated. They were found to be negligible in accordance with the linearity assumption.

These calculations invoke only scalar fields, which is consistent with the assumption of isotropic unperturbed inflation. In the present paper we are going to suppose that one or more vector fields exist during inflation. As we noticed in Section III A 2, the unperturbed (spatially homogeneous) part of a vector field will at some level cause anisotropic unperturbed expansion. This will break the rotational invariance of the evolution equations for the scalar [15, 40, 41, 65, 66], causing their spectra to be anisotropic. At the moment it is not understood how to calculate the spectra of scalar field perturbations in such a case, because the linear evolution equations have singular solutions [65, 66]. The generation of vector field perturbations will also be affected by anisotropic unperturbed expansion, though that has yet to be investigated. As we saw in Section III A 2, the level of anisotropy in the expansion is expected to be small and in this paper we simply ignore it.

B. Quantum field theory

There is no need to assume Einstein gravity during inflation. We need only the effective action for the scalar field, valid while relevant scales are leaving the horizon. We describe the standard scenario, in which ϕ is canonically normalized. Although the calculation works for a more general potential, it will be enough here to consider the quadratic case:

$$V(\phi) = \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi^2 + \dots \quad (43)$$

The action is then

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau d^3x \sqrt{-g} [\mathcal{L}_\phi(\tau, \mathbf{x}) + \dots] \quad (44)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi = -\partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - m^2 \phi^2. \quad (45)$$

This is supposed to hold to good accuracy while scales of interest leave the horizon, with m^2 practically constant during that era. The dots indicate contributions, which generate inflation if that is not already done by ϕ ^{#14}.

As the field is supposed to live in unperturbed spacetime described by the line element in Eq. (28) we can write

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau d^3x a^2(\tau) \left[-\partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - \frac{1}{2} a^2(\tau) m^2 - \dots \right], \quad (46)$$

with the index μ now raised by $\eta^{\mu\nu}$ instead of $g^{\mu\nu}$.

The unperturbed field equation is

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + m^2\phi = 0, \quad (47)$$

where an overdot denotes d/dt . We take inflation to be practically exponential so that $a \propto \exp(Ht)$. We assume that ϕ is a light field, defined as one with

$$|m^2| \ll H^2. \quad (48)$$

If this inequality is well satisfied there will be a slow roll solution $\dot{\phi} \simeq -m^2\phi/3H$, which is expected to hold more or less independently of any initial condition. Then the fractional change in ϕ over one Hubble time is much less than 1. If the inequality is only marginally satisfied it will be of order 1.

For the first order perturbation we work with $\varphi \equiv a\delta\phi$. It satisfies

$$\varphi''(\mathbf{k}, \tau) + (k^2 + a^2\tilde{m}^2) \varphi(\mathbf{k}, \tau) = 0, \quad \tilde{m}^2 \equiv m^2 - 2H^2, \quad (49)$$

^{#14} If it is done by ϕ there is slow-roll inflation with ϕ the inflaton, but we are not assuming slow-roll inflation and still less that ϕ is the inflaton within that paradigm.

where a prime denotes $d/d\tau$. To arrive at the quantum theory we need the action for $\delta\phi$, obtained from Eq. (45). After dropping a total derivative it is

$$S_{\delta\phi} = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau d^3x \left(\varphi'^2 + \partial_i \varphi \partial_i \varphi - \frac{1}{2} a^2 \tilde{m}^2 \right) \quad (50)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau d^3k \left[\varphi'^2(\mathbf{k}, \tau) - (k^2 + a^2 \tilde{m}^2) \varphi(\mathbf{k}, \tau) \right]. \quad (51)$$

For each $\mathbf{k}$ this is the action of an oscillator with time-dependent frequency.

We adopt the Heisenberg picture whereby the state vector is time independent. Promoting φ to an operator $\hat{\varphi}$ we write

$$\hat{\varphi}(\mathbf{x}, \tau) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\hat{a}(\mathbf{k}) \varphi(k, \tau) e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} + \hat{a}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) \varphi^*(k, \tau) e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \right]. \quad (52)$$

The mode functions $\varphi(k, \tau)$ satisfy the same evolution equations as the classical perturbations $\varphi(\mathbf{k}, \tau)$. The former are independent of the direction of $\mathbf{k}$ because the evolution equations do not pick out a preferred direction, and neither does the initial condition that we come to shortly.

The consistent quantization of this system requires the commutation relation

$$[\hat{a}(\mathbf{k}), \hat{a}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}')] = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'), \quad (53)$$

and the Wronskian

$$\varphi^*(k, \tau) \partial_\tau \varphi(k, \tau) - \varphi(k, \tau) \partial_\tau \varphi^*(k, \tau) = -i. \quad (54)$$

Well before horizon exit, φ is a linear combination of $\exp(\pm i k \tau)$. We make the usual choice

$$\varphi(k, \tau) \rightarrow \frac{e^{-ik\tau}}{\sqrt{2k}}, \quad (55)$$

which will be justified shortly. We postulate a unique vacuum state, annihilated by the $\hat{a}(\mathbf{k})$, and take the Hilbert space to be Fock space, whose basis is built by acting on the vacuum by products of the creation operators $\hat{a}^\dagger(\mathbf{k})$. The basis vectors are eigenvectors of the occupation number operator $\hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}} = L^{-3} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}$, which gives the number of particles with momentum $\mathbf{k}$. The particle interpretation can be justified using Eq. (16) for the energy momentum tensor. It shows that the vacuum state, with zero occupation number, has momentum density and pressure $\rho_{\text{vac}} = -P_{\text{vac}} = \Lambda^4/16\pi^2$ where Λ is the ultra-violet cutoff. This is set equal to zero by absorbing it into the scalar field potential. Then the energy-momentum tensor of a generic basis state is that of a gas of particles with the relevant occupation numbers. If the occupation numbers depend only on the direction of $\mathbf{k}$, the momentum density and anisotropic stress vanish, leaving pressure and energy density $P = \rho/3$.

The final step is to assume that the time-independent state vector is close to the vacuum state. In other words, we assume that the the occupation number $n_{\mathbf{k}}$ of the quantum states (averaged over a cell of $\mathbf{k}$ space) is much less than 1. With Einstein gravity, that assumption is mandatory if there have been $\Delta N \gg \ln(M_{\text{P}}/H_*)$ e -folds of inflation before cosmological scales leave the horizon, because the positive pressure $P \sim n_{\mathbf{k}}(k/a)^4$ from particles with momentum of order k/a would otherwise overwhelm the negative pressure $P = -3M_{\text{P}}^2 H_*^2$ that is required for inflation [1, 67]. The condition $\Delta N \gg \ln(M_{\text{P}}/H_*)$ is quite mild, and will almost certainly be satisfied for the shortest cosmological scale if inflation takes place at the usual high scale $H_* \sim 10^{-5} M_{\text{P}}$.

Instead of using the negative frequency mode function in Eq. (55), one might consider using a linear combination of positive and negative frequencies. This corresponds to using annihilation operators $\tilde{\hat{a}}_{\mathbf{k}}$, related to the original ones by a Bogoliubov transformation:

$$\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} = \alpha_k \tilde{\hat{a}}_{\mathbf{k}} + \beta_k \tilde{\hat{a}}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger, \quad (56)$$

with $|\alpha_k|^2 = 1 + |\beta_k|^2$. A Fock space vector, labelled by the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\hat{n}}_{\mathbf{k}} = \tilde{\hat{a}}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \tilde{\hat{a}}_{\mathbf{k}}/L^3$, does not have well-defined $n_{\mathbf{k}}$ and does not have well-defined energy-momentum tensor either. In a state where $\tilde{\hat{n}}_{\mathbf{k}}$ has expectation value $\langle \tilde{\hat{n}}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$, the expectation value of $\hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}}$ is

$$\langle \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle = \langle \tilde{\hat{n}}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle + |\beta_k|^2 \left(1 + 2\langle \tilde{\hat{n}}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \right). \quad (57)$$

The expectation value of the energy-momentum tensor in this state is that of a gas with occupation number $\langle \hat{n}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle$. As in the previous paragraph, it is reasonable to require this occupation number is much less than 1, in order to ensure that the positive pressure of the gas will not be significant at the beginning of inflation. Looking at Eq. (57), we see that this requires $|\beta_k| \ll 1$. In words, *the initial mode function cannot be much different from the negative frequency mode function in Eq. (55)*^{#15}.

This argument for the choice of the negative frequency solution relies on the fact that it minimizes the energy density *and* the pressure, of the gas of particles that will be present if any other choice is made. The standard argument [68] invokes only the energy density, which by itself would not be dangerous. Indeed, one is already discounting the vacuum energy density ρ_{vac} , which is permissible because it comes with $P_{\text{vac}} = -\rho_{\text{vac}}$.

C. Spectrum of the perturbation

To calculate the spectrum of φ , we identify the ensemble average in Eq. (2) as a vacuum expectation value, with φ replaced by $\hat{\varphi}$. Then

$$\frac{2\pi^2}{k^3} \mathcal{P}_\varphi(k, \tau) = |\varphi(k, \tau)|^2. \quad (58)$$

Apart from the reality condition, there is no correlation between different Fourier components, because there is no correlation between their vacuum fluctuations and no coupling between their evolution equations. In other words, the perturbation φ is Gaussian in the linear approximation that we are using.

The mode function is the solution of Eq. (49) with the initial condition Eq. (55). For $m = 0$ it is

$$\varphi(k, \tau) = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2k}} \frac{(k\tau - i)}{k\tau}. \quad (59)$$

Well after horizon exit this gives

$$\mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_\varphi}{a^2} \approx \left(\frac{H}{2\pi} \right)^2. \quad (60)$$

Keeping m , we can write Eq. (49) as

$$\left[\partial_\tau^2 - \left(\nu^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \tau^{-2} + k^2 \right] \varphi(\mathbf{k}, \tau) = 0, \quad (61)$$

with^{#16}

$$\nu = +\sqrt{\frac{9}{4} - \left(\frac{m}{H} \right)^2}. \quad (62)$$

This is the Bessel equation with independent solutions $J_\nu(k\tau)$ and $J_{-\nu}(k\tau)$. The solution satisfying the initial condition is

$$\varphi(k, \tau) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{aH}} \frac{e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}(\nu-\frac{1}{2})}}{1 - e^{i2\pi\nu}} [J_\nu(k\tau) - e^{i\pi\nu} J_{-\nu}(k\tau)]. \quad (63)$$

Well after horizon exit this gives

$$\varphi(k, \tau) \simeq e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}(\nu-\frac{1}{2})} \frac{2^\nu \Gamma(\nu)}{2^{3/2} \Gamma(\frac{3}{2})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2k}} (-k\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}-\nu}. \quad (64)$$

The field becomes classical in the sense that $[\hat{\varphi}(\mathbf{k}, \tau), \partial_\tau \hat{\varphi}(\mathbf{k}, \tau)]$ tends to zero [2], provided that ν is real. This condition corresponds to $m^2 < \frac{9}{4}H^2$. We reject the regime $m^2 \ll -H^2$ because the spectrum is too steep to be of interest.

^{#15} Of course, it also requires that the state is close to the vacuum state, corresponding to $\langle \hat{\tilde{n}}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle \ll 1$.

^{#16} As indicated we choose the positive sign.

In any case, the calculation almost certainly becomes invalid in this regime for two reasons. First, the unperturbed field ϕ will roll rapidly away from the origin, making it unlikely that the neglected terms of the potential in Eq. (43) remain negligible over the several Hubble times that it takes for relevant scales to leave the horizon. Second, the back-reaction of the perturbation on the metric will probably not be negligible. These are the considerations that require the light field condition in Eq. (48). Applied to negative m^2 , this condition is equivalent to $\nu \gtrsim 1$.

Well after horizon exit Eq. (64) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_{\delta\phi} &\simeq \frac{8\pi|\Gamma(1-\nu)|^{-2}}{(1-\cos 2\pi\nu)} \left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{2aH}\right)^{3-2\nu} \\ &\simeq \left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{aH}\right)^{n_{\text{scalar}}-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

$$n_{\text{scalar}} - 1 = 3 - 2\nu \simeq \frac{2m^2}{3H^2}. \quad (66)$$

The final equality is valid for $|m^2| \ll H^2$.

Instead of taking ϕ to be massless, one might think that a more accurate early-time approximation would be obtained by keeping the mass m . That is not the case though, because the classicality condition in Eq. (48) means that the effect of m is no bigger than the effect of the expansion rate H . Because m is so small, we cannot regard it as a mass term in a flat spacetime quantum field theory.

D. Spectral tilt

The scale dependence given by Eqs. (65) and (66) can be understood in the following way. Soon after horizon exit, when the classical perturbation first emerges, its spectrum is roughly independent of m , and hence $\simeq (H/2\pi)^2$. After that, the perturbation evolves according to Eq. (49) with $k^2 = 0$, which gives the second factor of Eq. (65).

Even more simply, we can understand the scale dependence just from the unperturbed equation (47). It is the same as Eq. (49) with $k = 0$ and has two independent solutions. One is proportional to $a^{2(\nu-1)}$ and the other to $a^{2(-\nu-1)}$. The second solution decays relative to the first by a factor $a^{-4\nu}$, and one expects that it will become negligible soon after horizon exit^{#17}. Using the first solution we again arrive at Eqs. (65) and (66).

The curvature perturbation is given in terms of the scalar field perturbations by Eq. (25). Let us take the initial epoch in that equation to be after all cosmological scales have left the horizon, but not too long after. Then the estimate Eq. (65) should apply to each scalar field perturbation. Supposing that a single scalar field perturbation dominates ζ , and using the tree-level expression for $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$, the spectral index n of ζ will obviously be equal to the spectral index n_{scalar} of the scalar field. The observed spectral tilt value $n - 1 \simeq -0.04$ suggests that the light field condition in Eq. (48) is very well satisfied by the relevant field.

Since the tree-level expression for $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ treats the field perturbations linearly, one can instead calculate the spectral index of ζ using the ‘horizon-crossing trick’, whereby the initial epoch is instead taken to be a fixed number of Hubble times after horizon exit for the scale k . This technique allows one to easily include a slow variation of H , defined by $\epsilon_H \equiv -\dot{H}/H^2$. It reduces n by an amount $6\epsilon_H$ if ϕ is the inflaton and by $2\epsilon_H$ otherwise. The horizon crossing technique also allows one to write down a formula for n if several scalar fields contribute, in terms of the first and second derivatives of the potential at horizon exit [1, 12, 67].

VI. GAUGE FIELD PERTURBATION FROM A TIME-DEPENDENT GAUGE COUPLING

In this section and the next, we see how a vector field perturbation may be generated. In this section we work with the following effective action during almost-exponential inflation:

$$S = \int d\tau d^3x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{4} f^2(\tau) F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \dots \right], \quad (67)$$

^{#17} Unless ν is close to 1 corresponding to $n_{\text{scalar}} \simeq 4$.

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu$ is the field strength with B_μ a gauge field. It can be written

$$S = \int d\tau d^3x \left[-\frac{1}{4} f^2(\tau) F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \dots \right], \quad (68)$$

where now the indices are raised with $\eta^{\mu\nu}$ instead of $g^{\mu\nu}$.

If f is time-independent it can be set equal to 1 because any constant value can be absorbed into B_μ . Otherwise, f represents a time-dependent gauge coupling. To respect invariance under time displacement, f should be a function of one or more fields with no explicit time dependence.

As with the scalar field, there is no need to assume Einstein gravity during inflation. The other terms in the action are supposed to give inflation with practically constant H , and to generate $f(\tau)$ without having any other effect on the evolution of the gauge field during inflation. For that to be the case, any scalar field coupled to B_μ must have zero value (no spontaneous symmetry breaking) with negligible quantum fluctuation around that value.

Starting with Ref. [69], this action has been widely considered for the generation of a primordial magnetic field, and it has recently been considered [8] for the generation of a vector field perturbation that can generate a contribution to ζ . In the latter context, an extension to include a mass term is studied in Refs. [5, 70].

By a choice of gauge we set B_0 and $\partial_j B^j$ equal to zero. We assume almost exponential inflation and work with the perturbation

$$\mathcal{A}_i \equiv f \delta B_i \equiv a \delta A_i. \quad (69)$$

We are absorbing f into the definition of the physical field A_i even though it is supposed to be varying while cosmological scales are leaving the horizon. At some stage f will become time-independent making A_i indeed the physical gauge field.

The perturbation has only transverse components, which satisfy the field equation

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda''(\mathbf{k}, \tau) + \left(k^2 - \frac{f''}{f} \right) \mathcal{A}_\lambda(\mathbf{k}, \tau) = 0, \quad (70)$$

with $\lambda = L$ or R . The prime denotes $d/d\tau$.

The quantization is just like the scalar case [71]. Each $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ has the scalar field action in Eq. (51), with $(a\tilde{m})^2$ replaced by $-f''/f$. We write

$$\hat{\mathcal{A}}_i(\mathbf{x}, \tau) = \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_\lambda \left[e_i^\lambda(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) \hat{a}_\lambda(\mathbf{k}) \mathcal{A}_\lambda(k, \tau) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} + e_i^{\lambda*}(\hat{\mathbf{k}}) \hat{a}_\lambda^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) \mathcal{A}_\lambda^*(k, \tau) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x}} \right], \quad (71)$$

with the sum going only over $\lambda = L, R$. The commutator is

$$\left[\hat{a}_\lambda(\mathbf{k}), \hat{a}_{\lambda'}^\dagger(\mathbf{k}') \right] = (2\pi)^3 \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \delta_{\lambda\lambda'}, \quad (72)$$

and the Wronskan of $\mathcal{A}_\lambda(k, \tau)$ is $-i$. Well before horizon exit f''/f is supposed to be negligible and one adopts the initial condition

$$\mathcal{A}_\lambda(k, \tau) = \frac{e^{-ik\tau}}{\sqrt{2k}}, \quad (73)$$

as well as the Fock space, and one assumes that the state is close to the vacuum state. These assumptions can be justified in the same way as for the scalar field case.

Following Refs. [8, 71] we adopt the parameterisation $f \propto a^\alpha$. Then Eq. (70) has the same form as Eq. (61) for the scalar field perturbation:

$$\left[\partial_\tau^2 - \left(\nu^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right) \tau^{-2} + k^2 \right] \mathcal{A}_\lambda(k, \tau) = 0, \quad (74)$$

with $\nu = |\alpha + \frac{1}{2}|$. Well after horizon exit, it leads to a classical perturbation with the spectrum

$$\mathcal{P}_\lambda(k, \tau) = \frac{k^3}{2\pi^2} \frac{1}{a^2} |\mathcal{A}_\lambda(k, \tau)|^2. \quad (75)$$

Using the solution of Eq. (74) with the initial condition in Eq. (73) we have

$$\mathcal{P}_L = \mathcal{P}_R \equiv \mathcal{P}_+ \simeq \left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{aH}\right)^{n_{\text{vec}}-1}, \quad (76)$$

$$n_{\text{vec}} - 1 = 3 - 2 \left| \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \right|. \quad (77)$$

The spectrum is scale invariant if $\alpha = -2$ or $\alpha = 1$ ^{#18}.

Since ν is always real, the vacuum fluctuation always gives a classical perturbation after horizon exit. We reject $\nu \gg 1$ (equivalent to $\alpha \gg 1$) because the predicted spectrum is too steep to be of interest.

As was pointed out in Ref. [72], a classical perturbation is obtained even with the standard gauge coupling corresponding to $\alpha = 0$. In that case the evolution of the mode function is not affected by horizon exit and $n_{\text{vec}} - 1 = 2$. This can be traced to the fact that the action is invariant under a conformal transformation of the metric, which means that we can go to the flat spacetime metric. After horizon entry during the post-inflation era, classicality is lost and we recover the vacuum state of the late-time quantum field theory, but that is of no concern in the present context. Of course it prevents one using the standard action to generate a primordial magnetic field (quite apart from the fact that the spectral index would anyway be too big for the field to be useful).

Taking H to be constant, the contribution of the vector field contribution to ζ has spectral index n_{vec} . As in Eq. (11) the vector contribution could dominate on small scales, and even the conformal invariant tilt $n_{\text{vec}} - 1 = 2$ might be allowed by the bound in Eq. (9) though that would need a rather low value $N(k_{\text{max}}) \sim 10$.

VII. VECTOR FIELD PERTURBATION WITH COUPLING TO R

A. The action

As an alternative to the previous case, we now consider the following effective action during inflation:

$$S = \int d\tau d^3x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} m_P^2 R - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \left(m^2 + \frac{1}{6} R \right) B_\mu B^\mu - \dots \right]. \quad (78)$$

The third term of this action violates gauge invariance. As a result, one cannot use gauge invariance to motivate the particular form of the kinetic term, and one cannot use any other internal symmetry either. The most general quadratic kinetic term consistent with Lorentz invariance is [15]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}} = -\beta_1 \nabla^\mu B^\nu \nabla_\mu B_\nu - \beta_2 (\nabla_\mu B^\mu)^2 - \beta_3 \nabla^\mu B^\nu \nabla_\nu B_\mu, \quad (79)$$

with ∇ being the covariant derivative. Gauge invariance requires $\beta_1 = -\beta_3$, which is the only restriction provided by symmetry considerations. The action in Eq. (78) invokes that condition, without the justification of gauge invariance.

The motivation for the action in Eq. (78) comes, not from symmetry considerations but because it has two remarkable properties. One property concerns the perturbation δB_μ that is generated from the vacuum fluctuation. As we will show in this section, the spectrum of the perturbation is scale-invariant if $m = 0$, for both the transverse and longitudinal perturbations. This calculation of the spectrum invokes no theory of gravity. The other remarkable property concerns the theory of gravity and will be described in Section IX (generalizing the action to include an arbitrary number of vector fields). These special properties perhaps suggest that the action in Eq. (78) can emerge in a natural way, in the context of field theory or perhaps string theory.

Much of the literature, starting with Ref. [73], goes further and identifies the field B_μ in Eq. (78) with the electromagnetic field. That requires its couplings to other fields (including the known Standard Model fields) to be of the standard gauge-invariant form even though there is no gauge invariance^{#19}. It seems to us to be a step too far, when one can as well generate a primordial magnetic field using the gauge invariant action of the previous section.

We require the other terms of the action to generate inflation, without affecting the evolution of B_μ during inflation. For that to be the case, any terms coupling B_μ to scalar fields should have a negligible effect. There is no reason to

^{#18} In Ref. [8] this is given incorrectly as $\alpha = -1$. Note that the value $\alpha = 2$, advocated in Ref. [71] in the context of a primordial magnetic field, makes the energy density rather than the field perturbation scale invariant.

^{#19} The form of the coupling of the photon to spin half fields is completely determined by renormalizability, but not the form of its coupling to the $W^\pm$ and Higgs fields.

suppose that such coupling occurs through the gauge-invariant terms of the form $-\mathcal{D}_\mu\phi(\mathcal{D}^\mu\phi)^*$. But if for instance a (global or gauge) $U(1)$ symmetry acts on the phase of ϕ but not on B_μ one might have a term of the form $-|\phi|^2 B_\mu B^\mu$ and then we are requiring that the $U(1)$ is unbroken with negligible quantum fluctuation, just as in the gauge-invariant case except that the $U(1)$ now has nothing to do with B_μ .

B. Generating the field perturbation

As the action in Eq. (78) contains no time derivative for the time component B_0 , this component is related to the space components B_i by a constraint equation^{#20}. We take the spacetime metric to be unperturbed.

The unperturbed field has zero time component, and the space components of the physical field $A_i = B_i/a$ satisfy [7, 73]

$$\ddot{A}_i + 3H\dot{A}_i + m^2 A_i = 0. \quad (80)$$

This is the same as for a scalar field with mass-squared m^2 .

As in the previous section, we work with the perturbation of the physical field, $\mathcal{A}_i \equiv a\delta A_i \equiv \delta B_i$. We expand its operator in the form given by Eq. (71), including now the longitudinal mode since there is no gauge invariance.

Consider first the transverse modes, $\lambda = L, R$. They satisfy the equation [5, 7]

$$[\partial_\tau^2 + a^2\tilde{m}^2 + k^2] \mathcal{A}_\lambda = 0, \quad (81)$$

where^{#21}

$$\tilde{m}^2 = m^2 + \frac{1}{6}R = m^2 - 2H^2. \quad (82)$$

This is the same as for a scalar field with mass-squared m^2 . The action for each of $\mathcal{A}_\lambda$ is also the same [66]. We adopt the initial condition, the Fock space, and the vacuum state assumption, with the same justification as in the scalar field case. Then

$$\mathcal{P}_+ \simeq \left(\frac{H}{2\pi}\right)^2 \left(\frac{k}{aH}\right)^{n_{\text{vec}}-1}, \quad (83)$$

$$n_{\text{vec}} - 1 = 3 - 2\nu \simeq \frac{2m^2}{3H^2}, \quad \nu \equiv \sqrt{\frac{9}{4} - \frac{m^2}{H^2}}. \quad (84)$$

A classical perturbation is generated if ν is real corresponding to $m^2 < 9H^2/4$. As with the scalar case, we reject the case $m^2 \ll -H^2$. The spectrum is too steep to be of interest, and anyway the evolution of A_i would be so rapid that additional terms in Eq. (78) (required to stabilize A_i) could hardly remain negligible over the several Hubble times that it takes for cosmological scales to leave the horizon. We therefore require

$$-H^2 \lesssim m^2 < \frac{9}{4}H^2. \quad (85)$$

As advertised, the tilt vanishes if $m = 0$.

Now we discuss the quantization of the longitudinal perturbation. Its mode function satisfies [5]

$$\left[\partial_\tau^2 + \frac{2k^2 aH}{(k^2 + a^2\tilde{m}^2)}\partial_\tau + (k^2 + a^2\tilde{m}^2)\right] \mathcal{A}_{\text{long}} = 0. \quad (86)$$

For $m = 0$ corresponding to $\tilde{m}^2 = -2H^2$, the independent solutions (given here for the first time) are

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{long}}^\pm(k\tau) \propto \left(-k\tau + \frac{2}{k\tau} \pm 2i\right) e^{\mp ik\tau}. \quad (87)$$

We see that the solutions are regular even at the point where the round bracket in Eq. (86) vanishes.

^{#20} For a generic choice of the kinetic term, B_0 becomes an independent field. Its perturbation is considered in Ref. [74, 75].

^{#21} We used the relation $R = -12H^2$, valid during exponential inflation.

We can show that the solution of Eq. (86) is non-singular even for $m^2 \neq 0$. This can be done by using the Frobenius method for differential equations with regular singular points (see for example Ref. [76]). First we make a change of variables

$$y \equiv \left(\frac{k}{a|\tilde{m}|} \right)^2 - 1, \quad (88)$$

with y varying in the region $-1 < y < \infty$. Eq. (86) with this transformation translates into the form

$$\left[\partial_y^2 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(y+2)}{y(y+1)} \partial_y + \frac{|\tilde{m}^2|}{H^2} \frac{y}{4(y+1)^2} \right] \mathcal{A}_{\text{long}} = 0, \quad (89)$$

with $\tilde{m}^2 < 0$ and the regular singular point at $y \rightarrow 0$. The general solution of this equation can be found using the ansatz

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{long}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} D_n y^{s+n}, \quad (90)$$

where $D_0 \neq 0$. In this case the series in Eq. (90) is convergent at least in the region $-1 < y < 1$ without a singular point. We will show that it converges even at this point and that the ansatz in Eq. (90) gives two independent solutions. To show this let us substitute Eq. (90) into Eq. (89) giving

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} D_n \left[4(s+n)(s+n-2)y^{s+n-2} + 8(s+n) \left(s+n - \frac{7}{4} \right) y^{s+n-1} + \right. \\ \left. + 4(s+n) \left(s+n - \frac{3}{2} \right) y^{s+n} + \frac{|\tilde{m}^2|}{H^2} y^{s+n+1} \right] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

In order for the equality in Eq. (91) to be valid, coefficients in front of each y with the same power must vanish. The coefficient in front of the term with the smallest power, i.e. y^{s-2} , is $4D_0s(s-2)$. Because $D_0 \neq 0$, from the indicial equation $s(s-2) = 0$ we find

$$s = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad s = 2. \quad (92)$$

Because these two solutions differ by an integer, it might be alarming that the general solution of Eq. (89) might involve the logarithm. However, by closer inspection of Eq. (91) we find that the coefficient D_2 of the series with $s = 0$ is arbitrary, thus the power series in Eq. (90) with $s = 0$ and $s = 2$ give two independent solutions. And because the series does not involve negative powers of y , i.e. $s \geq 0$, it converges at the singular point $y \rightarrow 0$.

The action corresponding to Eq. (86) is^{#22}

$$S_{\text{long}} = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau d^3k \mathcal{L}, \quad (93)$$

$$\mathcal{L} = (a\tilde{m})^2 \left[\frac{|\mathcal{A}'_{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k}, \tau)|^2}{k^2 + (a\tilde{m})^2} - |\mathcal{A}_{\text{long}}(\mathbf{k}, \tau)|^2 \right]. \quad (94)$$

To set the initial condition well before horizon entry we define $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = (a|\tilde{m}|/k)\mathcal{A}_{\text{long}}$. In the regime $a|\tilde{m}| \ll k$,

$$\mathcal{L} = \pm \left(|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}'|^2 - k^2 |\tilde{\mathcal{A}}|^2 \right), \quad (95)$$

where the sign $\pm$ is that of $\tilde{m}^2$, hence negative for the case of interest $\tilde{m}^2 \simeq -2H_*^2$.

Except for the negative sign this is same as for the scalar field case. To quantize it we assume the same initial condition $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \exp(-ik\tau)/\sqrt{2k}$, and adopt the vacuum state. The justification for these assumptions is similar to the

^{#22} This is given for the case $\tilde{m}^2 = -2H^2$ in Ref. [66], and it can be derived by perturbing the full action. Of course it is unique only up to a total derivative.

one that holds for the scalar field (and transverse vector field), but not identical because of the negative sign. Because of this sign, occupied initial states would have negative energy density and pressure, $P = \rho/3 \sim -n_k(k/a)^4$. As the pressure is negative it is not dangerous for inflation. Instead, it is the negative energy density that is dangerous. As the total energy density is required to be positive, the negative contribution of occupied states has to be less than the total at the beginning of inflation. Assuming as before $\Delta N \gg M_P/H_*$ e -folds of inflation before cosmological scales leave the horizon, this again requires occupation number much less than 1, justifying both the choice of initial mode function and the assumption of the vacuum state.

The spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{\text{long}}$ is given by Eq. (75). For $m = 0$, corresponding to $\tilde{m}^2 = -2H^2$, we find well after horizon exit

$$\mathcal{P}_{\text{long}} = 2 \left(\frac{H}{2\pi} \right)^2 = 2\mathcal{P}_+. \quad (96)$$

This corresponds to $r_{\text{long}} = 2$, which according to the discussion at the end of Section IV B 1 means that the vector field perturbation cannot generate the dominant contribution to the curvature perturbation.

It has been suggested [65, 66] that the action in Eq. (94) does not correspond to a well defined quantum field theory for negative $\tilde{m}^2$. We have demonstrated that there is a well defined quantum field theory even in this case. Before the epoch $|a\tilde{m}|^2 = k^2$, a negative $\tilde{m}^2$ corresponds to a negative kinetic term in the action. This will cause some degree of instability when more terms are included in the action, corresponding to the interaction of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{long}}$ with other fields and/or gravity. But such interactions are assumed to be negligible whenever one considers the generation of a gaussian classical field perturbation from the vacuum fluctuation, and as we mentioned already has been justified for both scalar and vector field perturbations. In this connection, it is important to realise that the negative sign holds only before the epoch $|a\tilde{m}|^2 = k^2$ which is around the time of horizon exit. Also, that only a limited number of e -folds of inflation take place between the emergence of k/a from the Planck scale and horizon exit, which means that there is only a limited amount of time for the presumably small interactions of $\mathcal{A}_{\text{long}}$ to have any effect. After horizon exit, the evolution at each location is given by the classical expression in Eq. (80) and we have no more need of the quantum theory. According to the classical expression A_i is slowly varying. It moves towards zero if m^2 is positive. If instead m^2 is negative moves towards the vev of A_i . That vev will be at the minimum of the potential $V(B_\mu B^\mu)$, whose leading term $m^2 B_\mu B^\mu / 2$ is displayed in the action in Eq. (78).

VIII. VECTOR CURVATON

We have described two mechanisms that can generate a vector field perturbation from the vacuum fluctuation. In this section and the next we describe two mechanisms by which such a perturbation can give a contribution to the curvature perturbation. We begin in this section with the vector curvaton mechanism [5]. This is the curvaton mechanism [46, 47, 48, 49], using a vector field instead of the usual scalar field.

The vector curvaton field $A_i(\mathbf{x}, \tau)$ is smoothed on a scale somewhat below the shortest cosmological scale and it has a perturbation $a^{-1}A_i = \delta A_i$. After horizon exit during inflation, the spatial gradient of A_i becomes negligible and it evolves at each point as an unperturbed field. In the simplest curvaton scenario, which we adopt, the evolution is negligible during and after inflation, until some epoch when A_i begins to oscillate. At this epoch, there is supposed to be Einstein gravity and the effective action is supposed to be

$$S = \int d\tau d^3x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu} F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} m^2 B_\mu B^\mu - \dots \right]. \quad (97)$$

This is the action of a massive vector field, living in the expanding Universe which is taken to be unperturbed. When H falls below the mass m , the field begins to oscillate with angular frequency m . As the spatial gradient is negligible, the oscillation is a standing wave whose initial amplitude varies with position.

As originally proposed, the vector curvaton scenario generates the perturbation δA_i with essentially the action in Eq. (78), taking m^2 to be a constant parameter which during inflation is negligible. For the present purpose there is no need to say how the perturbation is generated.

The energy density of the oscillation is, in terms of the physical field $A_i = B_i/a$,

$$\rho_A(\mathbf{x}, t) \simeq \frac{1}{2} m^2 |A(\mathbf{x}, t)|^2 \left(\frac{a_{\text{start}}}{a(t)} \right)^3 \quad (98)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} m^2 (|A|^2 + 2A_i \delta A_i(\mathbf{x}) + \delta A_i(\mathbf{x}) \delta A_i(\mathbf{x})) \left(\frac{a_{\text{start}}}{a(t)} \right)^3, \quad (99)$$

where a_{start} is the scale factor just before the oscillation starts. In the second line, $\mathbf{A}$ is the unperturbed value just before the oscillation starts and $\delta\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x})$ is its perturbation. The oscillation amplitude falls like $a^{-3/2}$, and is practically constant during one oscillation. As a result, the stress is practically zero just as in the scalar field case [5]. We take the decay to be instantaneous, which from the scalar field case we know will be an adequate approximation.

The contribution of ρ_A to the total energy density is supposed to be initially negligible, and with it the contribution ζ_A of δA_i to ζ . But the oscillation is supposed to take place in a radiation background, so that ρ_A/ρ grows like $a(t)$ and ζ_A becomes significant.

To calculate ζ_A we will use the following expression [49]:

$$\zeta_A = \frac{1}{3}\Omega_A \frac{\delta\rho_A}{\rho_A}, \quad (100)$$

$$\Omega_A \equiv \frac{3\rho_A}{3\rho_A + 4\rho_r} \simeq \frac{\rho_A}{\rho}, \quad (101)$$

where $\rho = \rho_A + \rho_r$. This expression is valid to first order in $\delta\rho_A$, which is evaluated on a ‘flat’ slice where $a(\mathbf{x}, t)$ is unperturbed.

We take the curvaton to decay instantly (sudden-decay approximation) and evaluate ζ_A just before the curvaton decays, assuming that ζ is constant thereafter. The final equality in Eq. (101) is justified because the sudden decay approximation gives an error of similar magnitude, both errors disappearing in the limit $\Omega_A = 1$. Evaluating $\delta\rho_A$ to first order we have

$$\zeta_A = \frac{2}{3}\Omega_A \frac{A_i \delta A_i}{|A|^2}. \quad (102)$$

The tree-level contribution to the spectrum is

$$\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_A}(k) = \frac{4}{9} \frac{\Omega_A^2}{|A|^2} \mathcal{P}_+(k) \left[1 + (r_{\text{long}} - 1) (\hat{\mathbf{A}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}})^2 \right], \quad (103)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{A}} \equiv \mathbf{A}/|A|$.

The spectrum $\mathcal{P}_+(k)$ is to be evaluated just before the oscillation starts. In Ref. [14] it is taken to be the same as that at the initial epoch during inflation and that in turn is supposed to be generated from the action in Eq. (78). Then $\mathcal{P}_+$ is given by Eq. (83) with n_{vec} practically equal to 1.

Evaluating $\delta\rho_A$ to second order we have [10]

$$\zeta_A = \frac{2}{3}\Omega_A \frac{A_i \delta A_i}{|A|^2} + \frac{1}{3}\Omega_A \frac{\delta A_i \delta A_i}{|A|^2}. \quad (104)$$

This is valid only for $\Omega_A \ll 1$. To handle the case $\Omega_A \simeq 1$ one could go to second order in $\delta\rho_A$, or much more simply evaluate N and hence δN directly^{#23}. All of this is the same as for a scalar field contribution, where the evaluation of N was done in Ref. [10]. We shall not pursue the case $\Omega_A \simeq 1$ in the present paper.

Our Eq. (102) is Eq. (64) of Ref. [5], generalized to allow $\Omega_A < 1$ and written to exhibit manifest invariance under rotations. The spectrum $\mathcal{P}_{\zeta_A}$ was not calculated in Ref. [5] but it was implicitly assumed to be rotationally invariant so that it could be the dominant contribution.

In accordance with the discussion at the end of Section IV B 1, this realisation of the vector curvaton mechanism cannot give the dominant contribution to ζ . It could do so by invoking several vector curvaton fields. We note that the case of several scalar curvaton fields has been considered in Ref. [77].

IX. VECTOR INFLATION

Recently, it has been proposed [14] (see also Refs. [78, 79, 80]) that inflation can be driven by a large number of independent vector fields. They considered only the unperturbed case, and invoked the large number to make the unperturbed metric practically isotropic. We consider the perturbation.

^{#23} To first order in $\delta\rho_A$, one finds by that method $N_A^i = 2\Omega_A A_i/3|A|^2$, in agreement with Eqs. (102) and (104).

The action is Eq. (78), extended to include many vector fields:

$$S = \int d\tau d^3x \sqrt{-g} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} m_P^2 R - \sum_b \left[\frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^{(b)} F^{(b)\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \left(m^2 + \frac{1}{6} R \right) B_\mu^{(b)} B^{(b)\mu} \right] - \dots \right\}. \quad (105)$$

As it is supposed to apply throughout inflation (starting with the approach of horizon exit for the largest cosmological scale $k \sim H_0$), the additional terms are supposed to be negligible throughout that era, and not just while cosmological scales are leaving the horizon. Also, the action is supposed to define the theory of gravity as well as the dynamics of the vector fields.

Consider first the unperturbed fields $B_i^{(b)}(\tau)$. Because each of them has a direction, the expansion is not generally isotropic but the anisotropy can be negligible if there is a large number of randomly oriented fields [14] which is assumed. Given a large number of fields, the randomness assumption is well justified because, as stated in Section III, the unperturbed field values are defined as spatial averages within a chosen box, whose location is random. By the same token, it does not seem reasonable to replace the randomness assumption by the assumption that there are three fields whose unperturbed values are orthonormal, though that would also give unperturbed spacetime [37, 38]^{#24}.

Varying the action with respect to an unperturbed field, one finds that Eq. (80) is satisfied. Varying the action instead with respect to the spacetime metric gives the right hand side of the Einstein field equation, which we take as the definition of the energy momentum tensor. For a generic spacetime, the term coupling R to the vector fields would make the form of this energy momentum tensor dependent on the metric; in other words it would modify Einstein gravity. Remarkably though, the modification is negligible when spacetime is practically unperturbed [14]. As a result we have the usual expressions, depending only on the vector field:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b,i} \left[\left(\dot{A}_i^{(b)} \right)^2 + m^2 \left(A_i^{(b)} \right)^2 \right], \quad (106)$$

$$P = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{b,i} \left[\left(\dot{A}_i^{(b)} \right)^2 - m^2 \left(A_i^{(b)} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (107)$$

The Friedmann equation therefore takes the usual form, $3m_P^2 H^2 = \rho$.

From Eqs. (80), (106), and (107) we see that each component of the unperturbed field is equivalent to a scalar field. In the regime $H^2 \gtrsim m^2$ there is inflation, with

$$H^2 \simeq \frac{1}{6} \frac{m^2}{m_P^2} \sum_b |\mathbf{A}^{(b)}|^2. \quad (108)$$

It follows that the number of e -folds to the end of inflation is given by the same expression as in the scalar field case [11, 81]:

$$N \simeq \frac{1}{4m_P^2} \sum_b |\mathbf{A}^{(b)}|^2. \quad (109)$$

Now we consider the curvature perturbation generated by vector inflation. It turns out to be practically the same as if the field components are replaced by scalar fields and that case has already been worked out using the δN formalism [81]. The derivatives of N for use in the δN formula are given by Eq. (109):

$$N_{A^{(b)}}^i = \frac{A_i^{(b)}}{2m_P^2}, \quad N_{A^{(a)}A^{(b)}}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2m_P^2} \delta_{ij} \delta_{ab}. \quad (110)$$

The transverse spectrum $\mathcal{P}_+$ of the field perturbations are given by Eqs. (76) and (77) (the same as for a scalar field) and the longitudinal spectra are $\mathcal{P}_{\text{long}} = 2\mathcal{P}_+$.

The spectrum $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ is given by Eq. (37) (without the scalar contribution), summed over all of the vector fields using $\mathbf{N}_{A^{(b)}} = \mathbf{A}^{(b)}/2m_P^2$. Since $m^2 \ll H^2$, we have $\mathcal{P}_+ \simeq (H_k/2\pi)^2$ for each field, where H_k is the Hubble parameter when

^{#24} The choice might be justified on anthropic grounds if isotropic expansion was favoured on those grounds but that there is no suggestion that such is the case. In particular there is no suggestion that the 30% or so of anisotropy allowed by present data is anthropically disfavoured.

the scale k leaves the horizon. Since there are a large number of randomly oriented fields we can pretend that they all have the same magnitude when evaluating the second term. Since the average of $\cos^2$ is $1/2$, this gives

$$\mathcal{P}_\zeta(k) = \frac{3}{2}N \left(\frac{H_k}{2\pi m_P} \right)^2. \quad (111)$$

Except for the factor $3/2$, the spectrum is the same as was found for the scalar field case [81]. Such a result is independent of the number of fields.

Assuming that $N \simeq 55$ e -folds of inflation take place after the observable Universe leaves the horizon, the observed magnitude of $\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ is reproduced if $H \simeq 10^{14}$ GeV at the end of inflation^{#25}. The non-gaussianity is negligible and the spectral index is $n = 1 - 2/N$.

In Ref. [79] (see also Ref. [80]) the tensor perturbation δh_{ij} is also considered, actually for a wide class of vector inflation models including the one considered here. The tensor perturbation is supposed to live in unperturbed spacetime, as in the standard calculation described in Section III A 2. But because the action in Eq. (105) does not correspond to Einstein gravity its linear evolution equation differs from Eq. (20). It is found that δh_{ij} can have significant time dependence, which makes it difficult to see how the prediction can be compared with observation.

To avoid these problems, one should go to the Einstein frame by making a conformal transformation of the metric. Suppose that we have an action of the form

$$S = \int d\tau d^3x \sqrt{-g} [fR + \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}(g_{\mu\nu}, \dots)], \quad (112)$$

with f being any scalar function of bosonic fields, and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}$ a function of the bosonic fields that is obtained from a flat spacetime expression through the replacements $\eta_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow g_{\mu\nu}$ and $\partial_\mu \rightarrow \nabla_\mu$ where ∇_μ is the covariant derivative^{#26}. Now we make a conformal transformation of the metric, $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = \exp(2\Omega)g_{\mu\nu}$ with $\exp(2\Omega) \equiv 2f/m_P^2$. After dropping a total derivative this gives [82]

$$\tilde{S} = \int d\tau d^3x \sqrt{-\tilde{g}} \left(\frac{1}{2} m_P^2 \tilde{R} + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{matter}} \right) \quad (113)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{matter}} \equiv 2\tilde{\nabla}_\mu \Omega \tilde{\nabla}^\mu \Omega + e^{2\Omega} \mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}(g_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}), \dots). \quad (114)$$

The usual application [82, 83] is to slow roll inflation, with $f(\phi)$ a function of just the inflaton field ϕ . Then the conformal transformation just gives ϕ a non-canonical kinetic term. The single field ϕ can be redefined to have a canonical kinetic term, so that we again have slow roll inflation though with a different potential.

In our case,

$$2f = m_P^2 + \frac{1}{6} \sum_b B_\mu^{(b)} B^{(b)\mu}. \quad (115)$$

Since f is slowly varying, there is almost exponential inflation in the Einstein frame just as in the original frame, with practically the same Hubble parameter H_* . Now though, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{matter}}$ is a complicated function, making the Einstein frame completely unsuitable for the calculation of the vector field perturbations, and hence of the curvature perturbation. It is however the one in which one should calculate the tensor perturbation.

Indeed, the standard first-order cosmological perturbation theory calculation described in Section III A 2 will apply in the Einstein frame, provided that the number of vector fields is large enough to make the anisotropic stress tensor negligible. The linear evolution of the tensor perturbation in the Einstein frame is then given by Eq. (20), and the spectrum is given by Eq. (21). The tensor fraction $r \equiv \mathcal{P}_{\text{ten}}/\mathcal{P}_\zeta$ is therefore given by the same formula as in the scalar field case, which is [81] $r = 8/N$.

Unfortunately these combined predictions for n and r are disfavoured by observation [18]. Making the masses unequal would make the spectral index even less than one without altering r [81], which increases the disagreement with observation. Therefore, the dominant contribution to ζ probably has to be generated after inflation.

Finally, we mention that in Ref. [79], more general vector inflation models are constructed, with the mass term replaced by a more general potential. These models are again equivalent to models with a large number of scalar

^{#25} With a standard cosmology after inflation, this high inflation scale indeed corresponds to $N \simeq 55$.

^{#26} This means that $\mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}$ is obtained from a flat spacetime expression using the equivalence principle even though the dependence of f upon the bosonic fields means that the full lagrangian violates the equivalence principle. Using the vierbein formalism, $\mathcal{L}_{\text{matter}}$ can include spinor fields.

fields. The spectra of the field perturbations are the same as before (since they invoke only almost exponential inflation without specifying its origin) but their effect on ζ depends in general on what happens at the end of inflation [45], which is determined by other terms in the action.

X. CONCLUSIONS

Until recently, it has been assumed that only scalar fields play a significant role during inflation. Then the spectrum of the curvature perturbation is statistically isotropic and homogeneous, and so are higher correlators that would correspond to non-gaussianity. Now, it is being recognised that vector fields might be significant during inflation. In that case, the correlators of the curvature perturbation will at some level be anisotropic (though still homogeneous). The anisotropy will occur if an unperturbed vector field causes anisotropy in the expansion rate, because that will cause the correlators of the scalar field perturbations to be anisotropic. It will also occur if a vector field perturbation contributes significantly to the curvature perturbation.

In this paper we have for the first time given expressions for the spectrum and bispectrum of the curvature perturbation, which include the second of these effects for a generic vector field.

On the theoretical side, we have for the first time considered the generation from the vacuum of a longitudinal vector field component, which will be present in the absence of gauge invariance. Taking its action to be that in Eq. (78), we have shown that it can be described by a quantum field theory, according to which its spectrum is twice that of the transverse field components.

We have also given general formulas for the statistical anisotropy of the spectrum and bispectrum, in terms of the longitudinal and transverse spectra of the nearly-gaussian vector fields. On the observational side, this leads to a very interesting situation regarding statistical anisotropy, which is very similar to that obtained a few years ago regarding non-gaussianity. The accepted mechanism for generating ζ , from the perturbation of the field(s) responsible for slow roll inflation, predicted negligible non-gaussianity [42], and gaussianity was taken for granted in most early analysis of the observations. Starting with the curvaton model [46, 47, 48] it was found [49] that instead the non-gaussianity could be large, and this motivated an intensive search for non-gaussianity.

Now that vector field contributions to the curvature perturbation are under consideration, statistical isotropy, which previously was taken for granted, should be reconsidered. We look forward to the opening up of a new area of research, in which predictions for the anisotropy are developed, and confronted with observation. In this context it should be emphasised that the bispectrum (and higher correlators) of the curvature perturbation might be completely anisotropic^{#27}, corresponding to the dominance by one or a few vector fields.

XI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

D.H.L. thanks Sean Carroll, Adrienne Erickcek, Marc Kamionkowski, Shuichiro Yokoyama, and Jun'ichi Yokoyama for useful correspondence. Y.R. and D.H.L. thank César Valenzuela-Toledo for useful comments and discussions. K.D. and D.H.L. are supported by PPARC grant PP/D000394/1 and by EU grants MRTN-CT-2004-503369 and MRTN-CT-2006-035863. M.K. is supported by the Lancaster University Physics Department. Y.R. is supported by COLCIENCIAS grant No. 1102-333-18674 CT-174-2006, DIF (UIS) grant No. 5134, and the ECOS-NORD Programme grant No. C07P02.

-
- [1] A. R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, *Cosmological Inflation and Large-Scale Structure*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
 - [2] D. H. Lyth and D. Seery, Phys. Lett. B **662**, 309 (2008).
 - [3] D. H. Lyth, Phys. Rev. D **31**, 1792 (1985).
 - [4] D. H. Lyth, JCAP **0606**, 015 (2006).
 - [5] K. Dimopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 083502 (2006).
 - [6] K. Dimopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 063506 (2007).
 - [7] K. Dimopoulos and M. Karčiauskas, JHEP **0807**, 119 (2008).
 - [8] S. Yokoyama and J. Soda, JCAP **0808**, 005 (2008).
 - [9] C. G. Böhm and D. F. Mota, Phys. Lett. B **663**, 168 (2008).

^{#27} See for instance Ref. [55].

- [10] D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodríguez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 121302 (2005).
- [11] A. A. Starobinsky, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **42**, 124 (1985) [JETP Lett. **42**, 152 (1985)].
- [12] M. Sasaki and E. D. Stewart, Prog. Theor. Phys. **95**, 71 (1996).
- [13] D. H. Lyth, K. A. Malik, and M. Sasaki, JCAP **0505**, 004 (2005).
- [14] A. Golovnev, V. Mukhanov, and V. Vanchurin, JCAP **0806**, 009 (2008).
- [15] L. Ackerman, S. M. Carroll, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 083502 (2007).
- [16] A. Hajian, T. Souradeep, and N. Cornish, Astrophys. J. **618**, L63 (2004).
- [17] A. Hajian and T. Souradeep, Astrophys. J. **597**, L5 (2003).
- [18] E. Komatsu *et. al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser. **180**, 330 (2009).
- [19] K. Kohri, D. H. Lyth, and A. Melchiorri, JCAP **0804**, 038 (2008).
- [20] B. J. Carr, J. H. Gilbert, and J. E. Lidsey, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 4853 (1994).
- [21] K. M. Smith, L. Senatore, and M. Zaldarriaga, arXiv:0901.2572 [astro-ph.CO].
- [22] L. Boubekeur and D. H. Lyth, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 021301(R) (2006).
- [23] N. E. Groeneboom and H. K. Eriksen, Astrophys. J. **690**, 1807 (2009).
- [24] C. Armendariz-Picon and L. Pekowsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 031301 (2009).
- [25] P. Kumar Samal, R. Saha, P. Jain, and J. P. Ralston, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **385**, 1718 (2008).
- [26] A. R. Pullen and M. Kamionkowski, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 103529 (2007).
- [27] H. K. Eriksen *et. al.*, Astrophys. J. **660**, L81 (2007).
- [28] H. K. Eriksen *et. al.*, Astrophys. J. **605**, 14 (2004). Erratum-ibid. **609**, 1198 (2004).
- [29] F. K. Hansen, A. J. Banday, and K. M. Gorski, arXiv:astro-ph/0404206.
- [30] C. Gordon, Astrophys. J. **656**, 636 (2007).
- [31] A. L. Erickcek, M. Kamionkowski, and S. M. Carroll, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 123520 (2008).
- [32] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 103515 (2003).
- [33] D. H. Lyth and Y. Rodríguez, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 123508 (2005).
- [34] R. W. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 2118 (1983).
- [35] R. M. Wald. *General Relativity*, University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- [36] L. H. Ford, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 967 (1989).
- [37] Y. Hosotani, Phys. Lett. B **147**, 44 (1984).
- [38] C. Armendariz-Picon, JCAP **0407**, 007 (2004).
- [39] D. Baumann *et. al.*, arXiv:0811.3919 [astro-ph].
- [40] S. Kanno, M. Kimura, J. Soda, and S. Yokoyama, JCAP **0808**, 034 (2008).
- [41] M.-a. Watanabe, S. Kanno, and J. Soda, arXiv:0902.2833 [hep-th].
- [42] J. M. Maldacena, JHEP **0305**, 013 (2003).
- [43] D. H. Lyth, JCAP **0712**, 016 (2007).
- [44] A. A. Starobinsky and J. Yokoyama, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 6357 (1994).
- [45] D. H. Lyth, JCAP **0511**, 006 (2005).
- [46] D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Lett. B **524**, 5 (2002).
- [47] T. Moroi and T. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **522**, 215 (2001). Erratum-ibid B **539**, 303 (2002).
- [48] A. Linde and V. Mukhanov, Phys. Rev. D **56**, R535 (1997).
- [49] D. H. Lyth, C. Ungarelli, and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 023503 (2003).
- [50] K. Bamba, C. Q. Geng, and S. H. Ho, JCAP **0811**, 013 (2008).
- [51] L. Campanelli and P. Cea, Phys. Lett. B **675**, 155 (2009).
- [52] C. T. Byrnes, K. Koyama, M. Sasaki, and D. Wands, JCAP **0711**, 027 (2007).
- [53] D. H. Lyth, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 3394 (1992).
- [54] D. Babich, P. Creminelli, and M. Zaldarriaga, JCAP **0408**, 009 (2004).
- [55] M. Karčiauskas, K. Dimopoulos, and D. H. Lyth, arXiv:0812.0264 [astro-ph].
- [56] H. R. S. Cogollo, Y. Rodríguez, and C. A. Valenzuela-Toledo, JCAP **0808**, 029 (2008).
- [57] Y. Rodríguez and C. A. Valenzuela-Toledo, arXiv:0811.4092 [astro-ph].
- [58] Y. Rodríguez and C. A. Valenzuela-Toledo, in preparation.
- [59] M. Sasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. **70**, 394 (1983).
- [60] A. Taruya and Y. Nambu, Phys. Lett. B **428**, 37 (1998).
- [61] D. Seery and J. E. Lidsey, JCAP **0509**, 011 (2005).
- [62] D. Seery, K. A. Malik, and D. H. Lyth, JCAP **0803**, 014 (2008).
- [63] D. Seery, J. E. Lidsey, and M. S. Sloth, JCAP **0701**, 027 (2007).
- [64] D. Seery, M. S. Sloth, and F. Vernizzi, JCAP **0903**, 018 (2009).
- [65] B. Himmetoglu, C. R. Contaldi, and M. Peloso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 111301 (2009).
- [66] B. Himmetoglu, C. R. Contaldi, and M. Peloso, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 063517 (2009).
- [67] D. H. Lyth and A. Riotto, Phys. Rep. **314**, 1 (1999).
- [68] J. Martin and R. H. Brandenberger, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 123501 (2001).
- [69] B. Ratra, Astrophys. J. **391**, L1 (1992).
- [70] K. Dimopoulos, M. Karčiauskas, and J. Wagstaff, in preparation.
- [71] J. Martin and J. Yokoyama, JCAP **0801**, 025 (2008).
- [72] D. Seery, arXiv:0810.1617 [astro-ph].
- [73] M. S. Turner and L. M. Widrow, Phys. Rev. D **37**, 2743 (1988).

- [74] E. A. Lim, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 063504 (2005).
- [75] S. Koh and B. Hu, [arXiv:0901.0429](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [76] A. L. Rabenstein, *Introduction to Ordinary Differential Equations*, Academic Press Inc, 1966.
- [77] Q. G. Huang, JCAP **0809**, 017 (2008).
- [78] T. Koivisto and D. F. Mota, JCAP **0808**, 021 (2008).
- [79] A. Golovnev, V. Mukhanov and V. Vanchurin, JCAP **0811**, 018 (2008).
- [80] A. Golovnev and V. Vanchurin, [arXiv:0903.2977](#) [[astro-ph.CO](#)].
- [81] L. Alabidi and D. H. Lyth, JCAP **0605**, 016 (2006).
- [82] N. Kaloper and K. A. Olive, Astropart. Phys. **1**, 185 (1993).
- [83] K.-i. Maeda, J. A. Stein-Schabes, and T. Futamase, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 2848 (1989).